THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE ORIGINS OF WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH'S SOCIAL ETHICS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
DONOVAN EBERSOLE SMUCKER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JUNE, 1957

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH. 43

II. THE INFLUENCE OF PIETISM 62

III. THE INFLUENCE OF SECTARIANISM. 80

IV. THE INFLUENCE OF LIBERALISM. 188

V. THE INFLUENCE OF TRANSFORMATIONISM 279

VI. THE CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY 310

BIBLIOGRAPHY 346

INTRODUCTION

Who is Walter Rauschenbusch?

A major paradox faces us in analyzing the work of Walter Rauschenbusch. He is an important figure in American Protestantism frequently given lavish priase; yet the character of his contribution is by no means agreed upon. There are many students of Christian social concern who have commented on the contribution of Walter Rauschenbusch. A review of these later in this chapter will reveal the fragmentary and contradictory character of these attempts to interpret Walter Rauschenbusch.

If there is any unanimity it comes in the common thread of interpretation that Walter Rauschenbusch is the greatest exponent of the social gospel. For example when Reinhold Niebuhr gave the Rauschenbusch lectures at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School he declared: "That they [the lectures] are an extension and an application to our own day of both the realism and loyalty to the Christian faith which characterized the thought and life of one who was not only the real founder of social Christianity in this country but its most brilliant and generally satisfying exponent to this day."[1]

Or, again when the eminent historian of the American churches, William Warren Sweet, issued the revised edition of his standard work he observed: "Walter Rauschenbusch through his three important books . . . probably did more than any other single man to carry the social gospel message over to the church as a whole."[2] In an earlier book, Professor Sweet had said that "as a prophet of the social message none performed a greater service to society and the church."[1]

---

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935), Preface.

[2] William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), p. 356.

The superlatives reach a climax in Henry P. Van Dusen's characterization: "It is clear, it seems to me, that the greatest single personal influence on the life and thought of the American church in the last fifty years was exerted by Walter Rauschenbusch. Probably the three most influential men in American church history have been Jonathan Edwards, Horace Bushnell and Walter Rauschenbusch."[2]

Niebuhr, Sweet and Van Dusen are actually typical of many others who see the Rochester social prophet as the greatest interpreter of the Social Gospel and, in general, a formidable person in recent American church history. Nevertheless the enigma remains. We do not know if Rauschenbusch's social ethics developed in sharp discontinuity with the past. If it is discontinuity then he stands in a unique place in Christian thought. If not, then it is necessary to see what continuity he does have with previous streams of experience and thought. In this quest to trace the continuity with the past, we shall want to know the chronological development of his thought, the basic streams of influence which flowed into his thinking and the way in which he accepts and rejects various insights from the other tributaries of experience and thought. In the process of making this investigation we shall want to know to what extent he reflects his environment and to what extent he displays his originality. And, if he displays basic originality then the fundamental motifs will be sought. A search will be made to find on what basis he relates those motifs to each other.

---

[1] William Warren Sweet, Makers of Christianity (New York: Henry Holt, 1937), p. 311.

[2] Henry P. Van Dusen. Quoted in Dores Robinson Sharpe, Walter Rauschenbusch (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942), p. 410.

The study is started against the background of many previous attempts to characterize Walter Rauschenbusch. These attempts range all the way from a major biography to briefer excerpts from books and essays dealing with broader topics than the life and work of Rauschenbusch. In setting forth these delineations of the Rochester social thinker, it will be clear that they are all fragmentary, seizing on only one aspect of the influences which really moulded his outlook.

The predicament in Rauschenbusch research is further revealed in the attempts to analyze his thought with only a passing interest in its origins and motifs. It is assumed that one can understand what a key person has said and done apart from the milieu and context in which this has taken place. In general, what emerges is an over-simplification of Rauschenbusch in terms of a single factor, the confusion of contradictory interpretations, and an unhistorical sense of discontinuity with previous influences and motifs.

To illustrate the situation in Rauschenbuschiana let us consider twenty or more attempts to characterize him. Then let us classify these characterizations under four headings, each of which has been given as the basic clue to his work. At this point a basic critique of all these interpretations will be offered which will show their limitations. This critique will then suggest the basic argument of this study: the study of origins is necessary to understand Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God ethics in terms of his unique selection and appropriation of materials from the four basic motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. This basic argument will be elaborated and explained, including the definitions of the four basic terms of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. Then will come a brief discourse on the limits and the possibilities of proving the assertion in the basic argument or "thesis." Our methodology will be in line with that of historians such as Nevins, Gottschalk, Collingwood and Becker. Finally, the preliminary materials will include a discussion of the quest for new facts concerning Rauschenbusch's origins and the four methods to be utilized in this quest. After these introductory matters are dealt with the dissertation will consider the chronological development of Rauschenbusch's thought. At this point the formal study will begin.

Among the score or more of interpreters of Rauschenbusch the following characterizations are typical, with one of these four usually being offered as the basic key to his work:

A. Rauschenbusch as Progressive Evangelical
B. Rauschenbusch as Liberal
C. Rauschenbusch as Prophetic Reactor to Capitalist-Industrialism
D. Rauschenbusch as Sectarian Radical

A. Rauschenbusch as Progressive Evangelical

1. Dores Robinson Sharpe

The major biography of Rauschenbusch is nearly five hundred pages long. It was written by Dores Robinson Sharpe who was Rauschenbusch's private secretary for a number of years. The chapter on "The Social Gospel Gets a Theology" concludes with this characterization:

> Such, in brief, was the new theology for the social gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch. For him it was the old theology, enlarged and socialized. For the church it was as warmly evangelically religious as the gospel for the salvation of the individual soul.[1]

Later in the biography Sharpe observes:

> He fed his soul on the Bible and the literature of the social renaissance.[2]

Throughout the book Sharpe insists over and over again that Rauschenbusch did not really change the basic foundations of the old evangelical theology except for the focus on social issues and the enlargement to include aspects of modern thought. Since Sharpe's is the only full-length biography of Rauschenbusch this view is highly influential. Because Sharpe assumes but does not define the term evangelical and because the references to the literature of the social renaissance are not systematic the clarity and usefulness of this characterization are somewhat limited. On the other hand, the characterization does imply that Rauschenbusch remained essentially in the basic tradition which he inherited and that he made only secondary modifications and adjustments. Obviously, this view invites further analysis of just what that tradition was and whether the modifications were only secondary.

---

[1] Dores Robinson Sharpe, Walter Rauschenbusch (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942), p. 355.

[2] Ibid., p. 426.

2. Winthrop S. Hudson

The present occupant of Rauschenbusch's chair of church history at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School makes the boldest argument for his predecessor as an evangelical. No one in America has pressed the point quite as consistently as Hudson.

"To the end of his life," writes Hudson in his book, The Great Tradition in the American Churches, "he was an evangelical in an era when evangelicalism as a dynamic movement had quite disappeared."[1] Even more striking is Hudson's statement likening this evangelicalism to that of Charles G. Finney and Lyman Beecher, two of the greatest [mass] evangelists of the nineteenth century. Treating the question of the Kingdom of God (where scholarly judgment is fairly well agreed that Rauschenbusch modernized Jesus), Hudson writes: "His conception of the Kingdom of God was--except for his awareness of the importance of social conditioning--essentially identical with the Kingdom of Christ as it had been preached by the earlier revivalists. Had he understood this, he would have spent less time attempting to draw distinctions between his theology and the old theology, and those who captivated by his spirit would have been less confused as to his basic convictions."[1] Hudson elaborates the latter point by arguing that the followers of Rauschenbusch exaggerated the elements in his books dealing with the New Theology and contemporary political and economic radicalism, thus missing the "distinctive and basic elements in his message."

---

[1] Winthrop S. Hudson, The Great Tradition in the American Churches (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p. 242.

Here, then, is a Rauschenbusch of evangelicalism who steered the ship of American Protestantism between an empty revivalism and an untheological humanitarianism. Continuity with the main trends in American Protestantism of the evangelical type is held to be the key. Only minor concessions to the new liberalism are discovered in Rauschenbusch; nothing is said of sectarianism. Moreover, his specific social analysis, we are told, "lacks the sturdy quality and real insight which, on the whole, characterizes his religious thought"[2]; nothing is said about his relation to Anglican, Roman or Calvinist universalism. Obviously, Professor Hudson bases his analysis on one master motif: the skillful continuity of Rauschenbusch with the Great Tradition of free church evangelicalism involving his rejection and correction of revivalism and semi-secular humanitarianism (the latter in the New Theology of the 1890's). Of all the analyses of Rauschenbusch this is the most singular, simple and consistent. In view of Rauschenbusch's deep roots in and direct contacts with Germany, in view of his general catholicity of development, it will be instructive to determine whether a single, peculiarly American motif can deliver the entire Rauschenbusch.

3. Vernon Parker Bodein

The only published doctoral thesis on Rauschenbusch is the one done at Yale by Professor Bodein. Released in 1944 under the title, The Social Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch and Its Relation to Religious Education, the thesis affirms this basic view: "In Rauschenbusch's thought is to be found a middle way between the two extremes of humanism and 'neo-orthodoxy.' Standing well within the evangelical tradition of the Protestant faith and never leaving it, Rauschenbusch at the same time presents a sensitivity to social need that should be the possession of all who pray 'Thy Kingdom Come.'[1] Chapter VII of the thesis is titled, "The Theistic and Evangelical Bases of Rauschenbusch's Concept of the Kingdom of God." The study ends with these words: "Religious education faces many problems today as it confronts the necessity for a strategy that will be not only realistic but also thoroughly Christian. The work of Rauschenbusch is worth re-reading as one seeks such a strategy. His combination of evangelical personal religion with sensitivity to social need comes close to the heart of the Gospel."[2]

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 232.

Bodein, even though a graduate of Colgate-Rochester, takes the diametrically opposite view from Hudson on the respective value of Rauschenbusch as a theologian and a social prophet. Bodein maintains that although Rauschenbusch did a pioneer and worth-while work in theology he used theological terms loosely; and that his genius was prophetic, not theological. On the other hand, Bodein agrees with Sharpe and Hudson that Rauschenbusch is basically an evangelical. Despite this disagreement with Hudson, Bodein makes no basic deviation from his view that Rauschenbusch can best be understood in continuity with American evangelicalism. Bodein offers certain qualifications of this view but his position is essentially the same as Hudson's. Much of the current Rauschenbusch scholarship is centered on this interpretation of Rauschenbusch as evangelical.

---

[1] Vernon Parker Bodein, The Social Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch and its Relation to Religious Education (New Haven: Yale University Press), p. vii.

[2] Ibid., p. 157.

4. Henlee Hulix Barnett

An unpublished doctoral thesis at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary by H. H. Barnett recommends Walter Rauschenbusch "as the best possible guide for the present social awakening among Southern Baptists. . . . Because his social concern grew out of his personal religion and his pastoral ministrations, he attempted to construct a Biblical ethics."[1] The Southern Baptist writer admits that certain corrections of Rauschenbusch must be made, particularly with respect to his non-catastrophic view of the Kingdom, his over-optimism about love and his trust in a moralistic Christianity. Barnett emphasizes that Rauschenbusch is not only the founder of the social gospel "but that he is still its most satisfactory interpreter."[2]

Therefore, once again Rauschenbusch is seen as progressive evangelical whose foundations were personal religion, pastoral experience and a basically Biblical ethics. Qualifications and criticisms are cited with abundant detail and ample documentation. But the familiar emphasis on evangelical continuity is here, Rauschenbusch now being called also a "fellow Baptist."

Rauschenbusch is viewed as a sound guide for the Southern Baptist social awakening because he is an exponent of Biblical ethics. There is no reference here to left-wing Protestant origins or, for that matter, to any other historical movement other than evangelicalism.

5. A. C. McGiffert, Jr.

The most discerning critique of Rauschenbusch as an evangelical has been given by President McGiffert. In his essay[3] the president of Chicago

---

[1] Henlee Hulix Barnett, The Ethical Thought of Walter Rauschenbusch (Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948), p. 6.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] A. C. McGiffert, Jr., "Rauschenbusch Twenty Years After," Christendom, III, No. 1 (1938), 98-109.

Theological Seminary joins with the previously cited men who see Rauschenbusch as evangelical. He argues that the characteristically evangelical emphases in the Rochester prophet's outlook are the trust in love, even when it does not provide a robust principle for social relations. McGiffert also notes that Rauschenbusch emphasizes the atonement for both sin and evil even though the atonement is not directly relevent to evil. Finally, Rauschenbusch is typical of evangelicals who fail to emphasize the incarnation and creation.

To McGiffert a sound social gospel must be based on the incarnation, the new creation and the atonement.

This essay abounds with striking insights that show the limitations of Rauschenbusch's alleged evangelicalism. But, like the others, it does not offer a full context for understanding Rauschenbusch, moreover, it assumes that the evangelical label is the proper key to the problem.

6. John C. Bennett

One of Rauschenbusch's sturdiest defenders and one of the most surprising in the texture of his interpretation is Bennett of Union Theological Seminary. Since 1936 he has defended the surprising thesis that Rauschenbusch and Reinhold Niebuhr do not differ in their ultimate expectation.[1] In face of the charge that Rauschenbusch accepts a facile optimism Bennett argues that he saw the danger of a real capitalist catastrophe and even the possibility of what today would be called a fascist coup.

As if it was not enough to link Rauschenbusch and Niebuhr together, Bennett goes on to link Rauschenbusch with Paul Tillich![2] In this statement the Union social ethics teacher declares that Rauschenbusch's greatest contribution was the concept of the social aspect of sin in terms of the Kingdom of Evil. This Kingdom of Evil and Tillich's demonic are essentially the same thing. Bennett also insists that Rauschenbusch's Prayers for the Social Awakening deeply affected the piety of the free churches.

---

[1] John C. Bennett, "The Social Interpretation of Christianity," The Church Through Half a Century, ed. by S. M. Cavert & H. P. Van Dusen (New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1936), p. 118.

[2] John C. Bennett, "Enduring Bases for Social Action," Social Action, IX, No. 6 (June 15, 1943), 18.

From this over-all portrait emerges a Rauschenbusch in touch with the realism of neo-orthodoxy and with a piety that is vitally related to the free, essentially evangelical churches. To be sure, Bennett no where puts the label "evangelical" on Rauschenbusch. But it is obvious that he sees a person working and witnessing in the classical Christian tradition, seeking to present a social gospel which was, in fact, only a modification of an old, old concern for social action. Bennett makes no attempt to subject Rauschenbusch to a specific historical analysis, and he offers no final classification of him except by inference. He does give, however, a general interpretation of the social gospel in America as a continuation of the prophetism initiated as far back as Israel itself. By implication Rauschenbusch is placed in this continuum. Bennett comes to the conclusion that many of the insights of Rauschenbusch and the earlier social gospel must be retained in the context of more recent neo-orthodoxy.

So much, then, for the very common interpretation of Rauschenbusch as progressive evangelical, as affirmed by Sharpe, Hudson, Bodein, Barnett, A. C. McGiffert and John C. Bennett. All these interpretations stress the constructive role of Rauschenbusch as correcting but not radically altering the evangelical background with which he started.

Is this the correct answer to our question: Who is Walter Rauschenbusch?

The answer is that this viewpoint is neither wholly accurate nor adequate to explain the real Rauschenbusch.

First, it is not accurate because Rauschenbusch is much more deeply rooted in German Pietism than in the Great Awakening of the eighteenth century

America or the English Wesleyan revival.[1] The term evangelical is a rather loose one but in America it is generally understood in terms of the Great Awakening and Wesleyanism rather than of German Pietism.

Second, whether we see Rauschenbusch in terms of German Pietism of American evangelicalism both concepts are inadequate to explain a social ethic of his type. From Albrecht Ritschl's Geschichte des Pietismus to John T. McNeil's recent book,[2] emphasis has been laid on the excessive inwardness and subjectivity, the tendency to become theologically superficial and a general trend to over-simplification in both pietism and evangelicalism. This is not to say that these movements have not had ethical implications or have not been creative in developing eleemosynary institutions. Rather, the point here is that only a major, structural alteration of pietistic evangelicalism can produce a social ethic of the Rauschenbusch type, or, for that matter, of any type. Hence, he cannot be interpreted as in basic continuity with this background of evangelicalism.

Finally, deeper source analysis reveals that a number of basic influences other than German pietism influenced Rauschenbusch. These influences were considerably more important than Pietism. Hence, to attempt to see Rauschenbusch fundamentally in terms of evangelicalism and/or pietism is quite incomplete, for this view rests upon errors of omission as well as upon a misplaced emphasis.

B. Rauschenbusch as Liberal

1. H. R. Niebuhr

In The Kingdom of God in America in 1937 H. Richard Niebuhr sees Walter

---

[1] George W. Davis, "The Origins and Principles of Evangelical Christianity," in The Crozer Quarterly, XXIII, No. 3 (July, 1946), 223, 225 for helpful definitions of evangelical Christianity.

[2] John T. McNeil, Modern Christian Movements (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954).

Rauschenbusch mediating between liberalism and evangelical notions of God's sovereignty, of the reign of Christ and of the coming Kingdom. In a widely quoted sentence from this book Richard Niebuhr said: "Though his theory of the relation of God and man often seemed liberal he continued to speak the language of the prophets and St. Paul."[1] Later on this precarious balance between liberalism and evangelicalism in the social gospel broke down with the liberalism triumphing. But this took place primarily after Rauschenbusch.

Fourteen years later Richard Niebuhr in Christ and Culture took a gloomier view of Rauschenbusch's work. Now Niebuhr classifies him with Albrecht Ritschl and a host of others starting with the Gnostics and continuing through Locke, Leibnitz, Kant and Jefferson as well as Harnack, Garvie, Shailer Matthews and D. C. Mackintosh. These are the liberals who affirm the "Christ of Culture." Ritschl is given a whole chapter in connection with this "Culture-Protestantism." In this chapter, Niebuhr writes that "Walter Rauschenbusch's social gospel presents the same general interpretations of Christ and the Gospel [as Ritschl], though with greater moral force and less theological depth."[2]

Since Christ and Culture is Richard Niebuhr's most mature book with a clear typology based on a lifelong encounter with Troeltsch's The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches we may take this estimate of Rauschenbusch as his most definitive one. In any case, the focus on Ritschl has strong internal evidence since Rauschenbusch makes this quite clear; and the present study will also stress this point in Chapter IV.

Assuming that Niebuhr's estimate in 1951 is his final thought of Rauschenbusch, it is questionable if it can provide the total explanation of Rauschenbusch even though this is a far more fruitful and accurate approach than the vague use of the term "evangelical." There is much of Ritchlian cultural liberalism in Rauschenbusch, as we shall show. But the question is whether this can be the whole answer; or, whether a dialectical conversation went on among four or five factors.

---

[1] H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company), p. 194.

[2] H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture (New York: Harper and Bros., 1951), p. 100.

2. Justin Wroe Nixon

Rauschenbusch's former student and later a vigorous Colgate-Rochester teacher also sees his mentor as a liberal Ritschlian but as influenced by American optimism, American political progressivism and Fabian socialism. Despite Rauschenbusch's many enduring contributions he admits that Colgate-Rochester's most famous teacher made three errors: an organic, evolutionary view of the Kingdom; limited doctrine of the church; an underestimation of the continuing selfishness of human nature.[1]

3. Conrad Henry Moehlman

First successor of Rauschenbusch in the chair of church history at Colgate-Rochester Conrad Henry Moehlman pictures Rauschenbusch as a radically humanistic person with numerous blind spots and weaknesses.[2] By 1917 Rauschenbusch's theology was incommensurable with that of 1890. Rauschenbusch was tempted by a pro-German attitude in both church and culture; he was too hostile to public schools, was historically superficial in understanding Christian social concern, and failed to understand Baptist origins. Thus, Moehlman would paint the picture of a man more liberal in theology than most would see him; and more reactionary in ethica and cultural questions than commonly understood.

4. Daniel Day Williams

In his Rauschenbusch lectures published in 1949 Daniel Day Williams bases his presentation on two convictions: (1) "There is solid ground in human experience for believing that the better world can be made"; (2) "Any enduring hope must be based, not upon man alone, but upon the fact that God is present in human history and is there creatively and redemptively at work. . . . These two convictions taken together place my thought within the tradition of the social gospel of which Walter Rauschenbusch was both prophet and pioneer."[1]

---

[1] Christendom, XXI, No. 4 (Autumn, 1947), 476-485.

[2] Crozer Quarterly, XXIII, No. 1 (Jan. 1946), 34-48.

Making more unmistakeable his view of Rauschenbusch as a liberal, Williams says in his first lecture:

> By 'liberal theology' I mean the movement in modern Protestantism which during the nineteenth century tried to bring Christian thought into organic unity with the evolutionary world view, the movements for social reconstruction, and the expectations of 'a better world' which dominated the general mind. It is that form of Christian faith in which a prophetic-progressive philosophy of history culminates in the expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. Its classic American expression is still, I believe, Walter Rauschenbusch's A Theology for the Social Gospel.[2] (Italics mine)

Here is a sound description of liberalism. Rauschenbusch is given credit for its classic exposition whose major affirmations on the Kingdom of God is accepted as valid even though Williams offers numerous criticisms in his theology which mediates between liberalism and neo-orthodoxy. The view of Rauschenbusch is clearly and consistently liberal with no attempt at further source analysis.

In any case, it must be made clear that Williams considers this Rauschenbusch liberalism as deeply Christian as neo-orthodoxy; and in some respects more so.

5. Paul Ramsey

The author of this text on Christian ethics presents a sharp criticism of Walter Rauschenbusch as a liberal who departed from the mind of Jesus when he dropped eschatology and substituted the law of evolutionary development and social action. This law of evolutionary development naturalizes and gradualizes the divine agency. Now social action has a new agent, man, who is responsible for giving himself the Kingdom.[1]

---

[1] Daniel Day Williams, God's Grace and Man's Hope (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 22.

Again no other clues to Rauschenbusch are suggested except this modernizing process.

6. William Adams Brown

In the essays seeking an appraisal of liberal theology, William Adams Brown considers Rauschenbusch as the representative of the "older liberalism" in contrast to a more realistic "newer liberalism." While acknowledging Rauschenbusch's masterly social analysis of the predicament, Brown asserts that his remedies and conclusions "seem almost naively optimistic. His solution is the familiar liberal prescription of an appeal to reason addressed to free men."[2] Also, Brown is impressed by the relatively small role of the church in the analysis of Rauschenbusch, another mark of the older liberal theology.

In a reminiscent mood the former dean of Union considers this--and quite properly--as a part of the Ritschlian theology. Sound as this point is, he does not go beyond it in seeking to understand the Rauschenbusch of the "older liberalism."

7. Abel E. Burckhardt

In 1925 a Swiss Protestant wrote a Master's thesis at Union Theological Seminary entitled, Walter Rauschenbusch As a Representative of American Humanism.

The pattern of the argument is as follows:

(1) Rauschenbusch has an inadequate and inconsistent theory of per-

---

[1] Paul Ramsey, "A Theology for Social Action," Social Action, (Oct. 15, 1946), p. 10.

[2] William Adams Brown, "The Church" in Liberal Theology, An Appraisal (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942), p. 259.

sonal religion since he gives a humanists answer to mysticism.

(2) Sin has no sense except in the social realm.

(3) He moved toward a position where society personified at its best is labeled God.

(4) The atonement and Jesus are humanized entirely. Jesus is what human nature can be at its best.

(5) Only prayer seems to remain in the older way, having an objective bearing and being more than personal uplift.

(6) Rauschenbusch is representative of eight other humanists: Rufus Jones, G. A. Coe, G. B. Smith, Edward S. Ames, R. W. Sellars, H. A. Overstreet, F. Adler and John Dewney.

This, of course, is more than a liberal, Protestant Christianity. This presses the point to the breaking, making the position a robust humanism. Again, no other key is suggested but this overwhelming fact.

8. Ralph Henry Gabriel

The well-known Yale scholar of America ideas is enthusiastic about Rauschenbusch because he rejected the romanticism of Sheldon (In His Steps) and the dogmaticism of Herron to spell out the religious side of the American democratic faith. And this faith has come through Enlightenment humanism. Rauschenbusch set aside the crassy materialistic gospel of wealth and the secular religion of humanity (Tom Paine) but he does converge with the secular religion of humanity in his emphasis on the democratic dream coming true as an earthly reality.[1]

What is new here is the identification of Rauschenbusch's ideas with the Enlightenment and placing primary emphasis on the American democratic faith of which the religious expression is only one facet. This is much more precise source analysis in regard to some of the liberal elements in Rauschenbusch and the clue on the Enlightenment will have to be pursued further. On the other hand, this is another over-simplified interpretation of Rauschenbusch.

---

[1] Ralph Henry Gabriel, The Course of American Democratic Thought (New York: Ronald Press, 1940), pp. 324-330.

9. John Herman Randall, Jr.

In a notable essay on "The Churches and the Liberal Tradtion," Professor Randall depicts Rauschenbusch as the leader of the social gospel movement who "shared the common Ritschlian theology of the idealistic humanists" and based "his criticisms of capitalism and its program of reconstruction of faith in an immanent God indwelling in organic society, whose progressive realization would bring about the Kingdom of God on earth. . . And this Kingdom would be the completest expression of the liberal democratic idea."[1]

Rauschenbusch had many notable achievements: he became the only American prophet heard in Europe; he was a poet like St. Francis rather than a stern prophet like Herron and Niebuhr. But above all, "He did more than any other in bringing about an emotional fusion between the churches and the liberal tradition."[2] With greater subtlity Randall basically underscores the Gabriel thesis. In addition, he connects Rauschenbusch with his theological roots in Ritschl. Clearly, however, the democratic liberal is for Randall the key to the situation.

10. Walter Marshall Horton

A characteristically fresh interpretation is given by the Oberlin theologian.[3] He presents Rauschenbusch as a liberal following Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Royce in a doctrine of original sin which unites the Marxian view

---

[1] The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLVI, (March, 1948), 162.

[2] Ibid., p. 163.

[3] Walter Marshall Horton, Realistic Theology (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943), pp. 72-74.

(historical states governed by the ruling class) and the orthodox Christian view (sharing guilt with others).

Hence, liberalism, Marxism and orthodoxy meet in Rauschenbusch. Here is a less simple analysis than most which should stimulate us to search for a multiple pattern of origins. On the other hand, Horton reads the Marxist label into Rauschenbusch despite the lack of explicitly Marxist analysis in his rather distinctly Fabian socialism.

11. I. M. Haldeman

The most powerful attack on Rauschenbusch's Christianity and the Social Crisis was by I. M. Haldeman, a Baptist premillennarian who was pastor of the First Baptist Church in New York. The argument is that Rauschenbusch is a liberal who took his material from church history rather than the Bible. In the Bible we have a Jesus without the slightest interest in ethical problems and trusting in an eschatology at loggerheads with the progress concepts of Rauschenbusch. The work of Jesus was Messianic not socialistic.

This is typical[1] of many conservative interpretations in which Rauschenbusch scrambles the New Testament while promoting a dubiously Christian socialism.

It underscores one of Rauschenbusch's problems with Biblical eschatology (which by-passes Schweitzer and Weiss when they might have been read!) but it adds nothing for a deeper understanding of the man.

Rauschenbusch as evangelical and Rauschenbusch as liberal are the two leading interpretations. We have already dealt with the former. What of the latter?

1. The term liberal is more accurate in relation to Rauschenbusch than

---

[1] I. M. Haldeman, Professor Rauschenbusch's Christianity and the Social Crisis (New York: 1908), 42pp. See also an attack by the former president of Wheaton College, J. Oliver Buswell, The Bible Today, Vol. LXXIX (April, 1945).

the term evangelical. For example, Daniel Day Williams is quite correct in placing Rauschenbusch in the general American liberal context. Likewise, Nixon, Brown and Randall are correct in noting the Ritchlian idealism in the Rochester professor's background. Gabriel is also helpful in insisting on the effect of the Enlightenment on Rauschenbusch.

2. Liberalism, on the other hand, is not adequate to explain the total sweep of causation and origin. It relates him to only one segment of church history in the idealistic theologians, leaving out a number of other factors in left-wing Protestantism, Calvinism and Catholicism. Moreover, it also interprets Rauschenbusch rather fully in terms of ideological movements without calculating the effect of capitalist industrialism.

3. The master ideas of liberal thought are not the only ideas found in Rauschenbusch, hence, it is an incomplete explanation of his life and work. For example, a number of his concepts on the role of religion in human culture are more sectarian than liberal.

Therefore, while there is much that is characteristically liberal in Rauschenbusch this cannot be the key in the view of its inadequacy and incompleteness. He is more than the prophet of the American democratic faith and more than the Enlightenment.

C. Rauschenbusch as Prophetic Reactor to Capitalist Industrialism

1. Henry F. May

Professor May's illuminating book on the Protestant social conscience presents a provocative view of Rauschenbusch as the expositor and systematizer of progressive social Christianity which came as the reaction to capitalist industrialization after the Civil War. This movement did not originate with the disinherited but rather with the educated and pious middle class. It grew from argument not agitation; it pleaded for conversion not revolt.

This progressive social Christianity of which Rauschenbusch was the systematizer came partly from collectivist currents in social science and indirectly from theological developments. Primarily this progressive, middle class social Christianity was due to a series of strikes, depressions and bankruptcies which no longer could be viewed as part of Divinely regulated unchangeable social order. The causation thus was historical and existential.[1]

Once developed the movement remained middle class, missing the radical left and the conservative right as well as the functional masses in the labor movement. Nevertheless, despite its weaknesses it encouraged the American collectivist progressivism which is a real part of the American scene.

The key here is Rauschenbusch as one caught up in a general reaction to the American industrial scene. Here history is creating and moulding the ideas rather than vice versa. Here theological and ecclesiastical backgrounds are not as important as sensitivity to the basic movement of American culture.

2. Aaron Ignatius Abell

Another Harvard study, The Urban Impact on American Protestantism 1865-1900 reveals Rauschenbusch as a veteran city pastor who was present when urbanism began to place a terrible strain on the church. Thus, strategically located, aided and abetted by Marx, George and Bellamy Rauschenbusch was one "who helped join religion and social reform."[2]

Again the key to Rauschenbusch and his contemporaries is their reaction and response to the great strains and new demands of huge, teeming industrial cities.

---

[1] Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 203, 216, 222, 235, 265.

[2] Aaron Ignatius Abell, The Urban Impact on American Protestantism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943), pp. 114-115.

3. Charles H. Hopkins

Charles Hopkins is lavishly praised for writing the most authoritative study of the social gospel.

In his study Rauschenbusch is seen as the one writing the most significant publications of his time in the United States if not in the English language. Also he influenced the religious life of his time more than any other person of his time, providing "Protestantism with a vital stimulating and unsurpassed formulation of the Christian sociology it had so long sought."[1]

The basic thesis of Hopkins, however, is that Rauschenbusch moves from a pietistic background to a Kingdom of God socialism under the impact of a major reaction to American capitalism. Thus, the major prong was the abrasive effect of capitalism while the minor prong was the scientific stimulus of evolution-immanence in biological science and the organic-solidaristic in social science.[2]

While this is a much richer presentation than Abell and while it has greater theological depth, it still makes the reaction to industrialism the major key to both Rauschenbusch and the social gospel, even though accompanied by scientific and theological motifs which served to stimulate the reaction.

Another way of understanding Hopkins is to view his book as presenting the interaction between the Christian faith and scientific thought under the hammer blows of capitalist industrialism.

Rauschenbusch as prophet of judgment on capitalist industrialism; Rauschenbusch as reactor to capitalist industrialism: Do these give us the sole key to the real Rauschenbusch?

---

[1] Charles Howard Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), p. 216.

[2] Charles Howard Hopkins, "An American Prophet, A Biographical Sketch of Walter Rauschenbusch," in A Gospel for the Social Awakening compiled by Benjamin Mays (New York: Association Press, 1950), pp. 18-19.

1. Obviously, this insight is basic since history must be taken seriously. Ten years in New York and extensive experience in Europe plus basic encounter in a middle sized industrial city in America (Rochester) during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth are not to be taken lightly. Capitalism was rough, industrialism was ugly but dynamic urbanism was unplanned and massive. Surely this is a powerful triumverate!

2. On the other hand, capitalism _qua_ capitalism and industrialism _qua_ industrialism do not possess any inherent capacity to stimulate reaction. Millions have lived under their sway without any prophetic revulsion. Indeed, it is often a combination of numbing dulling effects on the one hand; and, affectionate, ideological embrace on the other. The real point is that Rauschenbusch reacted in a _special_ way to capitalist industrialism. Until we unearth the sort of theological and historical self-consciousness which Rauschenbusch _brought_ to this experience we will not know why he reacted in the way he did.

D. Rauschenbusch as Sectarian Radical

1. M. B. Reckitt

In his _Faith and Society_ M. B. Reckitt gives an Anglican critique of the social gospel in general and Rauschenbusch in particular.

The charges are these:

1. It is a sectarian "sub-lunar" presentation which is alienating socially concerned individuals from the schools of Christianity which treasure the validity of eschatology, mysticism, sacramentalism and other theological considerations.

2. While throwing over the old Calvinist dogmatism, the social gospel retains the Puritan tendency to "identify somewhat too rashly one's own social

ideals with the ultimate purposes of God."[1]

Reckitt's whole argument is that Rauschenbusch and the Federal Council (the book was written in 1932) are presenting only one version of Christian social concern. Rauschenbusch and the Federal Council are giving a version that creates "alarm" in the Episcopal, Catholic and other more traditional churches.

There is no profound source analysis of any kind here but the perspective from Anglican catholicity suggests that further analysis should take place to see what is radically Protestant in Rauschenbusch.

2. Luther A. Weigle

Luther Weigle uses rather extravagant language concerning the work of Rauschenbusch which makes him a sectarian mystic. The passage is as follows: "The principles of the 'social gospel' found clear and effective presentation in the work of Walter Rauschenbusch, on whom was 'the learning of the scholar, the vision of the poet and the passion of the prophet.' . . . with the courage of Savonarola, he combined the gentleness and love of a St. Francis. . . . He was more than a social reformer; he was a mystic of the simplest highest type, who realized in his own life what Brother Lawrence called 'the practice of the presence of God.' "[2]

Savonarola, St. Francis, Brother Lawrence! These characterizations suggest a Rauschenbusch who was a combination of some contradictory tendencies--a politically active, Christian statesman, a romantic lover of poverty and a simple mystic of the commonplace.

3. Visser t' Hooft

---

[1] Maurice B. Reckitt, Faith and Society (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1932), p. 188 and, in general, Chapter VI.

[2] Luther A. Weigle, American Idealism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928), p. 216.

The Background of the Social Gospel in America was published in 1928 by the man who is now general secretary of the World Council of Churches--it is a brilliant, historically oriented, polemical book.

Rauschenbusch is seen as the father of the social gospel as Edwards was the father of revivalism.[1]

Rauschenbusch is historically superficial in making social concern too recent but he is correct in making his type of social concern unprecedented.

Rauschenbusch tends toward humanism and panentheism in theology.

Rauschenbusch has an optimistic and idealistic sociology. This is combined with a fearless facing of the facts.

The foregoing points are more familiar than Visser t' Hooft's really creative insight in which he insists that the social gospel of the Rauschenbusch type is a rejection of natural law, the relative law of compromise in favor of the sectarian ideal of ethics qualified by modern thought. His exact words are these:

> The social gospel is a revival of this sectarian ideal (Troeltschian sense) but now applied to the whole of society and not only to a limited group. It is in that sense the first attempt to 'try' to Christianize on a large scale and to apply its principles without the aid of an intermediary conception.[1]
>
> It is sectarian interpretation qualified by modern scientific ideas of evolution and sociological relationships and universalized so as to become a social ethics for humanity at large.[2]
>
> Essentially it means the universalization of the ethics of family life. The family is fundamentally solidaristic; society should be permeated with the same spirit. The family is based on cooperation rather than competition; the same should be true of society at large. Within the bond of the family there is no place for inequality; in society too there should be no inequality at least of opportunity. Family relations are personal; in social and industrial life the personal element should also come to its rights.[3]

---

[1] W. A. Visser t' Hooft, The Background of the Social Gospel in America (Haarlem: H. D. Tzeenk, Willink & Zoon, 1928), p. 51.

[2] W. A. Visser t' Hooft, *ibid*., p. 51. [3] *Ibid*., p. 64.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 52.

After making the sectarian interpretation of absolutely following Jesus by the application of love, Visser t' Hooft then warns:

> But the parallel with the sectarian type of Christianity should not be pressed too far. There are most decisive differences to be noted. The typical sect is far from evolutionistic in its view of the future of mankind; it is definitely apocalyptic. It is also dualistic and in many cases withdraws from the world for that reason. The social gospel, on the contrary, is monistic in its tendencies; it stresses the immanency of the Kingdom; it believes in gradual organic growth of the perfect social order. It does not fly from the world but affirms it in order to change it. It is optimistic in its view of human nature.[1]

Visser t' Hooft along with Reckitt and Weigle have given us a very important clue in delineating the real Rauschenbusch, a clue much neglected in current studies. Rauschenbusch's father made the move from Lutheran pietism which contains some sectarian elements to the Baptist church where the sectarianism is stronger and, in addition, his scholarly studies took him rather fully into Anabaptist left wing groups. Walter Rauschenbusch maintained this concern with the Anabaptist heritage. His lectures and essays make this quite clear. As a matter of fact, this sectarianism may afford our most important single clue along with other factors also important. In general, we have seen that the keys to Rauschenbusch have been inadequate or incomplete, thus obscuring our understanding of the social gospel from 1865-1929.

To get the full, sound picture of Rauschenbusch we need to analyze carefully the following factors that influenced him:

1. Sectarian radicalism
2. Lutheran and Baptist pietism
3. Calvinist and Catholic transformationism
4. Enlightenment liberalism

The interaction among these, though not equal or even, will show the real Rauschenbusch, a pietistic, catholic, liberal, socialist sectarian!

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

What is suggested by these twenty attempts to characterize Rauschenbusch's formulation of Christian social concern?

It is clear, first of all, that Rauschenbusch is interpreted in a variety of conceptual contexts with a minimum of factual material.[1] The use of concepts is the attempt to give meaning to the so-called facts taken into account. The exception to this generalization is the D. R. Sharpe biography which is a virtual anthology of factual material--much of it in his own collection of Rauschenbusch manuscripts--with a very tenuous conceptual foundation which seems to be incidental to the chronological narrative of his life and thought. The relation of factual material to the theoretical context is not soundly balanced in any of the works cited.

Second, the motifs which are utilized fall into a pattern which reveals that the evangelical and liberal themes are dominant. The emphasis on the sectarian aspect of Rauschenbusch's background is almost unknown, particularly among American scholars. The utilization of the pietist motif is also seldom used and, in any case, is buried under the more commonly used term evangelical. There is also an emphasis on the stimulation of urban-industrial capitalism in calling forth the social ethic clothed in either liberal or evangelical garments. Therefore, the major trends in Rauschenbusch interpretation ignore the pietist and sectarian themes which were basic in the earliest nurture of his home where both were operative and basically influential.

Third, these studies reveal a strong tendency toward a single factor approach with the attendant problems involved in over-simplification.

The first limitation of the single factor approaches is their tendency to be mutually exclusive. To H. F. May, for example, the answer is in something altogether external to theology located primarily in collectivist currents in social science discovered by the educated middle-class Protestants as they observed the pathologies of capitalism. H. Richard Niebuhr's latest characterization of Rauschenbusch as a Ritschlian Christ-of-culture liberal is in conflict with M. B. Reckitt's view of Rauschenbusch as a sectarian who developed a synthesis which no Catholics of any parties can accept. McGiffert's and Hudson's view of Rauschenbusch as an evangelical conflicts with both Niebuhr and Reckitt. The sharp either-or aspect of the single-factor analysis therefore rules out a multiple viewpoint. Yet at the same time the multiple approach calls for serious consideration in the understanding of Rauschenbusch. This suggests an inquiry to discover how various facets of Rauschenbusch's thought interacted on each other. While there are persons who can be understood with a single-motif analysis, Walter Rauschenbusch is not one of them. Both Walter and August Rauschenbusch struggled with most of the complex theological and cultural forces of the nineteenth century; and Walter also encountered a number of influences in the early twentieth century. Moreover, the Rochester formulation of social ethics took place in the mind of an eclectic spirit that permitted the freest kind of borrowing from various currents of thought and experience.

---

[1] Paul K. Hart and William J. Goode, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952) Chapter I. Note discussion of the relation of facts to theory.

There is a fourth comment which is suggested by our survey of current Rauschenbusch research. Previous objections to the single-factor methodology have been formal and logical. There is also a more fundamental objection. Most of these interpretations presuppose unexamined notions concerning origins. The former research concerning Rauschenbusch has operated primarily in the context of his adult Zeitgeist, ignoring the complex influences in his early life mediated by his father in the context of education and travel in Europe and America. Even during the Zeitgeist of his adult years the interest in sources and origins is quite marginal. The statement quoted in the previous sections of this chapter are not the conclusions of systematic studies on origins but obiter dicta in the midst of expositions and summaries of what Rauschenbusch believed about social concern; or, critiques of what he said in comparison with more recent Christian social thought.

We see, then, that the relation of fresh, factual material adequate to a sound theoretical context is not balanced in any of the works cited. The single-factor approach to the origins of his social ethics must be ruled out because most of these conceptions are mutually exclusive; and, because it precludes the possibility of a more complex approach where a number of factors and motifs interact on one another. Finally, previous studies presuppose unexamined notions of Rauschenbusch's background set forth as marginal comments in connection with more recent surveys of social concern.

All of the foregoing considerations give rise to the demand for a fresh study of origins and sources in the context of a more adequate typology.

This approach raises basic questions of definition: What is the role of the search for origins in historical research? What does origin mean? Why is a study of origin necessary? How does one demonstrate origin? We must deal with these questions before setting forth the particular typology of this study as well as before setting forth our basic argument.

First, numerous scholarly studies utilize origins in their approach. A quotation from the preface to The Origins of the Reformation by James Mackinnon suggests how the concept of origins operates in his book:

> The origins of the Reformation are to be sought much farther back than the beginning of the sixteenth century, which witnessed the revolt of Luther against the mediaeval church. The Reformation was the ultimate outcome of a complex movement of reaction and, more or less, of emancipation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries from mediaeval conditions in Church and State, which marks the transition from the mediaeval to the modern age. Throughout these centuries a variety of factors were operating towards the religious upheaval to which the religious genius and indomitable will of Luther, in the fulness of time, gave the decisive impulse. Their operation is discernible in the political, economic, social,

> constitutional, intellectual as well as the religious and moral history of the late mediaeval period.[1]

In a crucial concluding sentence Mackinnon declares that "each of these forces or factors contributed to prepare the way for the great disruption of the church in the early sixteenth century known as the Reformation."[2] From this point of view the sixteenth century Reformation cannot be studied by itself; it is "the ultimate outcome of a complex movement of reaction"[3] which started two centuries earlier. A historical development must therefore be seen in the total continuum starting with the first origins. This insight is not true for antiquarian reasons but for purposes of contemporary understanding. Indeed, it is one of the fixed results of historical criticism to reject any approach to ideas without context, without antecedents or without a pattern of development.

Granted the force of this insight on historical context, there is the dimension of the sui generis whereby the reality of human freedom is revealed. At this level a person, a movement or a school of thought cannot be explained wholly by the historical continuum. At this level freedom enters to deal with the given factors in a creative and original way.

This study will reveal both of these truths: on the one hand, Walter Rauschenbusch's reflects and responds to a series of basic influences in this historical continuum, and, on the other hand, Walter Rauschenbusch expresses his freedom through the creative way in which he utilized these basic influences.

In any case, origin in this dissertation is view as a tool or key providing insight into various strands of influence. More specifically it points to antecedents, sources, roots, rises, beginnings, parentage, or ancestry of a person, movement, school of thought or idea. Origin emphasizes the original form of a given motif located in a given starting point. By starting the study at the earliest possible period the emphasis on origins gives the proper perspective on the total development and nature of a given motif.

---

[1] James Mackinnon, The Origins of the Reformation (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), p. vii.

[2] Mackinnon, ibid. [3] Ibid.

The study of origins applies with particular relevance to Walter Rauschenbusch because of his very close relationship to his father who preceeded him in the profession of teaching church history and who prepared the way for him in theological and cultural developments. Even farther back than his father Walter Rauschenbusch has roots in generations of intellectual distinction and sensitivity to scholarly currents and movements. Professor Carl Schneider of Eden Theological Seminary views August Rauschenbusch as a representative man "who in an unusually and dynamic way reflected religious and cultural tensions within and between German and American movements of the day."[1] He emerges from the interpenetration "of the German and American traditions with a sense of freedom and emancipation which we shall refer to as his Americanization."[2] This sense of freedom led Walter Rauschenbusch to an even more complex encounter with the great master forces of the past and of the era in which he lived. We must observe, however, that in this encounter Professor Schneider overlooked a very crucial and additionally complicating factor, namely, the left-wing, sectarian roots of both father and son. In any case, Rauschenbusch's composite background, the continuum with his father and earlier generations of literate Protestant leaders, the geographical setting in two continents, demand a study of his antecedents, sources, roots and ancestries. This is the meaning of origins. This is the importance of a study of origins.

The necessity of studying origins suggests the basic argument of this dissertation:

---

[1] Carl E. Schneider, "The Americanization of Walter Rauschenbusch," Church History, XXIV, 3.

[2] Ibid.

The study of origins is necessary to understand Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God ethics in terms of his unique selection and appropriation of materials from the four basic motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism.

Specifically, this means that the study of origins is necessary in order to reveal the hitherto obscured role of sectarianism in his ethics and its subsequent entry into the mainstream of his thought along with the other three motifs. The study of origins is also necessary in order to reveal the chronological development of these four major motifs. The study of origins is further necessary in order to understand the manner in which Rauschenbusch adapts and appropriates these motifs so that nothing remains exactly as originated. The study of origins is necessary to shed light on the tensions and contradictions in his system which have been vulnerable to criticism. It is necessary to emphasize his permanently valuable contribution by showing that he drew on a complex of motifs rather than relying solely on the liberal consensus of his day. Finally, the study of origins is necessary to view Rauschenbusch in the concretely particularistic garments of the forces, movements, thinkers and books that influenced him.

The negative purpose of this study is to avoid various configurations of Rauschenbusch made in the image of the researcher in terms of unexamined notions concerning the sources and motifs of his social ethics.

In setting forth the basic argument or "thesis" of this study we have made reference to four basic motifs: pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and Catholic and Calvinist transformationism. Since this typology constitutes the context for our study it is necessary to pause for definitions before proceeding to show how origins can be demonstrated.

Pietism in this study refers to the Protestant reaction starting in the seventeenth century against orthodox intellectualism and formalism in favor of a personal, devotional, subjective, individualistic, conversionist Evangelicalism stressing vital religious experience. Walter Rauschenbusch's father came to America in 1846 under the auspices of the Langenberg Society, a biblicist and inter-confessional missionary agency stimulated by Württemberg pietism. The Rauschenbuschs belonged to the evangelical rather than to the mystical or "spiritualist" kind of pietism. While August Rauschenbusch left the Lutheran church because of his pietism he was a pietist with churchly rather than conventicle or "cellular" tendencies.[1]

Sectarianism or left-wing Protestantism in this study is a term which signifies a particular view or doctrine of the church as an intentional, committed, suffering, lay-centered, Biblically-oriented fellowship living in conflict with the culture. The sectarian view of the church stresses individual discipleship, love and ethical reality rather than polity, sacraments or theological formulations. In addition, this view emphasizes the separation of church and state, and affirms a demand for religious liberty.

This definition arises from the way in which Ernst Troeltsch developed the term in his The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches as over against the churchly view of the church as a more priestly, hierarchically organized, sacramentally developed pattern which tends to be at peace with the culture. The term is also based on the definition which Roland H. Bainton provided in his essay on "The Left Wing of the Reformation."[2]

---

[1] James Hastings Nichols, History of Christianity, 1650-1950 (New York: Ronald Press, 1956), pp. 80-81; Paul Grunberg and Carl Mirbt, "Pietism," Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1911), IX, 67; Albrecht Ritschl, Geschichte des Pietismus in der lutherischen Kirche des 17 und 18 Jahrhunderts (Bonn: A Marcus, 1880), I, 3-80.

[2] Journal of Religion, XXL, No. 2 (April, 1941), 125.

In using the term sectarian in this study the present writer is not unmindful of criticisms of the term, particularly in relation to the new American pattern of denominationalism; and also in relation to the tendency for the two types to interact on one another. Nevertheless, the term has had wide use since Troeltsch and has survived numerous attempts at redefinition.

Using Troeltsch's typology of different sectarian types, one notes that Rauschenbusch was drawn more to the aggressive sects which sought to make politically relevant applications of their vigorous Christian testimony concerning the judgment and love of God in Christ. Nevertheless, further study reveals that characteristics of both the aggressive and non-aggressive sects persist in his theology and ethics.

Liberalism and Enlightenment liberalism are used in this study to refer to the rationalistic movements of the eighteenth century which revolted against authoritarianism in both religion and culture while using a scientific method.[1]

In this study the term actually has a double meaning: theological and cultural. Theological liberalism as Rauschenbusch represents it, is an attempt to purge Christianity of irrational and peculiar elements which imposed alien developments upon the Christian faith and the Christian church. It seeks also to moralize the Christian tradition, and to lessen the purely supernatural and sacramental elements in favor of the practical and universal factors in Christianity. The term Cultural liberalism as applied to Rauschenbusch refers to the second phase of liberal thought whereby the State is to be used to curb anti-social and unethical forces in the culture; and where voluntary associations of laborers and consumers will press the claims of justice against the mammonistic forces of money and management. The meaning of cultural liberalism in Rauschenbusch passes beyond the first phase of liberal thought which assumed that if the economic order is left alone its inherently harmonistic tendencies will bring back essential order and justice. Initially it arose to correct the collapse of freedom in medieval economic and political life. In any case, cultural liberalism in Rauschenbusch affirms the desirability of political democracy through unfettered parliamentary institutions and democratic socialism.

---

[1] See Constructive Theology, 1950, unpublished lecture notes of Daniel Day Williams for a definition of liberalism in these two ways.

Transformationism is the fourth motif utilized in the dissertation. It refers to the positive and hopeful attitude toward culture based on the oneness of creation and redemption, of incarnation and atonement.[1] This motif is not the simple synthesis of Christ and culture but rather a pointing to the mighty deeds of God calling for human response. It emphasizes the universal scope of Christ's rule with a genuine here-and-now hope of transforming a ruthless economic system through the Kingdom of God which is coming through socialism.

In this study specific reference is made to the Catholic kind of transformationist in the persons of Maurice and Kingsley. And the study also notes Rauschenbusch's use of Ragaz and Kutter who represent the Reformed or Calvinist transformationism in pre-Barthian Europe.

Apart from these four specific transformationists utilized by Rauschenbusch, the definition as given here should no doubt include that deeply ingrained impulse of American Protestantism to make America Christian. This impulse has a hopeful attitude toward cultural change under the sanctions of the Christian faith.[2]

These definitions of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism set forth the basic vocabularly of this study. These definitions belong in the total context of the discussion on the necessity of studying origins, the basic argument of this study and the movement away from a single-motif approach. The crucial and final question in this introduction is how to demonstrate the origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics.

---

[1] H. Richard Niebuhr, Chapter VI, "Christ the Transformer of Culture," Christ and Culture (New York: Harper and Bros., 1951), pp. 190-218.

[2] Robert Handy, "Toward a Christian America," Church History, XXXII, 15.

Several preliminary observations are needed before setting forth the specific method of establishing the origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics.

When dealing with a historical question like this one cannot establish absolute proof. It is possible to seek evidence which will permit, or make probable a particular conclusion concerning the origin of Rauschenbusch's social ethics.

Among the logicians M. R. Cohen and E. Nagel have underscored the above point in their An Introduction to Logic and the Scientific Method. William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt have made a similar emphasis in Methods in Social Research.[2]

It is among historians, however, that the consensus on this point is most important for this study. Allan Nevins in The Gateway to History not only affirms the inherent limitation of probability in historical research but also the fact that ad hoc tests of evidence are needed. These tests vary with the witnesses and the circumstances.[3] R. G. Collingwood's Idea of History agrees on the role of probability and then adds a special emphasis on the role of inference as basic to all scientific methodology. The exact sciences are more compulsive in their inferences, and the inductive sciences are more permissive

---

[1] M. R. Cohen and E. Nagel, An Introduction to Logic and the Scientific Method (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1934), p. 325.

[2] Paul K. Hatt and William J. Goode, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952), p. 87.

[3] Allan Nevins, Gateway to History (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1938), p. 76.

in using inference.[1]

A quotation from Carl L. Becker concludes this survey of historians on the method of research in relation to absolute proof: "The simple historical facts turn out not to be a hard, cold something like a brick. It is, so far as we can know it, only a symbol, a simple statement which is a generalization of a thousand and one simpler facts which we do not for the moment care to use and this generalization we cannot use apart from the wider facts and generalizations which it symbolizes."[2]

A second preliminary observation is that there are both advantages and disadvantages in dealing with the origins of Walter Rauschenbusch's ethics in view of his life span between 1861 and 1918.

Offhand, it would appear advantageous to deal with a person whose published and unpublished works are readily available. Likewise, it would appear advantageous to deal with a figure known to eyewitnesses who are still alive. For example, Rauschenbusch's personal secretaries, D. R. Sharpe and Edwin Dahlberg have been available to the present writer. Louis Gottschalk in his A Primer on Historical Method makes much of the eyewitness as the key to primary sources.[3] Or, again, here is a figure who was involved in movements such as the Federal Council of Churches and the Fellowship of Reconciliation which are still functioning in our own day. There are advantages, then, in studying a person whose published and unpublished works are available, whose close colleagues are accessible, and a person who helped to start organizations which are aware of this initial influence.

---

[1] R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 255.

[2] Carl L. Becker in H. E. Barnes (ed.), A History of Historical Writing (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1937), p. 268.

[3] Louis Gottschalk, Understanding History, A Primer on Historical Method (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1950), pp. 52-53, 209.

On the other hand, there are disadvantages in our effort to study a man who lived between 1861-1918. Professor Gottschalk has pointed out that there are fewer debatable issues in connection with St. Augustine than with Walter Rauschenbusch.[1] A person with the stature of Augustine who lived between 354-430 A. D. has been studied for centuries. The Library of Congress lists about two hundred entries under the name of Augustine, thus suggesting that great effort has gone into Augustinian studies. Moreover, certain questions regarding Augustine, by definition, will remain unanswerable until more documents become available. In contrast, Rauschenbusch's career is so recent that Professor Roland H. Bainton of Yale heard Rauschenbusch give the Taylor Lectures in New Haven, April of 1917.[2] Let us assume that approximately two hundred people heard these lectures and that one hundred of this group are still alive. To find all of the evidence still available for a man who died in 1918 would mean checking with this group of one hundred and the thousands of other individuals involved with Rauschenbusch in many other situations. No person living has heard Augustine.

The disadvantage, then, of studying Rauschenbusch as a twentieth century individual is the impossibility of finding every shred of evidence. And, in general, there is the problem of being close to this man in terms of movements, motifs and personalities. This closeness makes it more difficult to be objective. Finally, the small number of Rauschenbusch studies suggests gaps in our knowledge of his life and thought.

How then shall we demonstrate origins in connection with Rauschenbusch? The question is asked on the assumption that the demonstration is not absolutely conceived and that there are peculiar advantages and disadvantages in studying Rauschenbusch.

---

[1] Personal conversation, Chicago, Ill., December 7, 1956.

[2] Personal conversation, Chicago, Ill., November 28, 1956.

The answer is that a new theory, a new conceptual framework, is needed along with new facts. "Basic to modern science," write Goode and Hatt, "is an intricate relation between theory and fact."[1] Theory is conceptualization and classification, permitting new relations among facts. Facts are empirically verifiable observations which fit into a particular theoretical framework.

The new theory has already been mentioned and defined, namely, the approach to Walter Rauschenbusch's origins through a four-fold pattern of motifs: pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. This approach aims to reveal the manner in which Rauschenbusch adapts and synthesizes these motifs to create a fresh orientation for Christian social concern. This approach aims also to reveal the chronological development of these motifs, particularly the hitherto obscured rise of sectarianism.

New facts understood in the theoretical framework of this study are needed to shed light on the origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics. These facts in this framework will give us a permissible and highly probable approach to origins. These are four in number.

First, the family background of Walter Rauschenbusch is a clue to the earliest influences which moulded his outlook on the Christian faith and the particular culture in which he lived. As the son of a complex, nineteenth-century, liberal (in the sense of the revolution of 1848 in Germany), Lutheran-Baptist-sectarian pietist, German-American, Walter Rauschenbusch is conditioned by a particular family milieu. The origins of Walter Rauschenbusch's thinking in relation to family is particularly clear in the pietist and sectarian dimensions of his background. The family conception of education, liberal arts and fine arts was liberal. But this was not articulated fully until later in his youth. In any case, basic attitudes and ideas originated in this particular family background.

---

[1] Goode and Hatt, op. cit. pp. 8, 13, 16, 41, 43. As further insight here Goode and Hatt observe that "facts take their ultimate meaning from the theories which summarize them, classify them, predict them, point them out and define them. However theory may direct the scientific process, facts in turn play a significant role in the development of theory. New and anomalous facts may entail new theories." p. 16.

Second, this study will take into account the *Zeitgeist* or the basic spirit of the times in order to delineate the origins of his ethics. The way in which Rauschenbusch responded to the challenge of his day was determined, in part at least, by the over-all cultural and spiritual climate in which he grew up in Germany and America. To be sure, it will not suffice to describe this *Zeitgeist* and then assume that, *ipso facto*, this is the total explanation of Rauschenbusch's approach to theology and ethics. Nevertheless, it is a task we must undertake since a given *Zeitgeist* is ubiquitous and early in its operation as an influence. Particularly is this true of the broad attitudes and the peculiar quality of the mentality mediated by the *Zeitgeist*.

The most difficult part of this quest is to find what Professor Sidney Mead calls the presuppositions of a period which are "back of the whole articulated structure" as "commonly assumed and practically unquestioned assumptions."[1] Despite this rather hidden character of these self-evident assumptions, they must be examined for clues to origins.

Thus for Rauschenbusch, his family and his *Zeitgeist*, are ways of discovering the beginnings of his social ethics. To search for these is not to assume a simple, compact, unified *Zeigeist*, since the spirit of the times contain contradictory factors just as every system of belief stimulates a system of disbelief. Likewise, many forces are at work in his family background.

If family and the basic spirit of the times provide ways of showing the origins of his ethics, the third way to demonstrate these origins is through Rauschenbusch's own understanding of himself--that basic self-image which gave him a selective factor by which to select and reject influences in his environment.[1] This is a good example of the interaction of the theory (Kingdom of God as key to Christian faith and works) and the facts (basic experiences and influences in his life).

---

[1] Sidney E. Mead, *What is the Place of Church History in the Curriculum?* (Chicago: Meadville Theological School, 1956), p. 6.

The origins of Rauschenbusch's ethics will be found in part, in this image of himself as one who had discovered the clue to the entire Bible, the total sweep of the Gospel, the needs of human culture and the nature of the church as a Kingdom-bearing agency. This selective principle of the Kingdom was, of course, influenced by earlier developments, by earlier origins. Yet, once chosen, the Kingdom motif moves through pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism selecting and rejecting and, in this process, becomes an originating factor.

This self-image in Rauschenbusch was based on an uncommon amount of conscious historical awareness. He was aware of his roots in Lutheranism and pietism. He made numerous references to his relationship to the left-wing of the Reformation. He was deeply aware of and excited by the liberating power of reason in the new liberalism. He felt the tides of history, he knew that he lived in a special historical era.

The fourth and final way of indicating origin is through a study of the books and the thinkers who shaped his thinking. Again, we are aware of the difficulties, indeed, the inherent limitations of absolute proof at this point. It will be a case of permissible inference with regard to probable influence.

For any of us there are books we have encountered in a most marginal and temporary way. They have not moulded or originated our conceptions. There are books we have read to confirm what we already believe. This kind of reading is ex post facto. Yet there are books which have a basic role in our development despite the fact (as Professor Gottschalk insists) that we do not receive ideas unless we are culturally prepared.[1] Hence, we read seriously the books we are prepared to read even though they may formulate, and amplify something previously present in a formless, simple or naive manner.

---

[1] Mead, ibid., calls this self-image "ideology" or what people think they are doing or saying. It is how individuals or groups understand themselves.

Surely it made a difference for Rauschenbusch to single out Ritschl, George and Harnack rather than Marx, Augustine and J. Edwards. Surely it is significant when he vigorously promoted, praised and quoted Heath's Captive City of God rather than Augustine's City of God; or, that Heath's book is singled out more than various other books which receive only passing reference. This suggests the necessity of trying to distinguish between the books that were most probably influential in originating his ethics and those which were least influential. This would place the emphasis on those books and writers with which he had a basic encounter rather than a marginal relationship.

Demonstration of origins, then, will be attempted by four methods: the evidence from Walter Rauschenbusch's family background, the evidence from the cultural and theological Zeitgeist of his day, the evidence from Rauschenbusch's own self-image and self-understanding, and the evidence from the key books and writers utilized in his thinking.

Because Zeitgeist is a more general kind of influence it will be dealt with the least. The Rauschenbusch family background will operate in three chapters, pietism, sectarianism and liberalism. The self-image of Rauschenbusch as a prophet of the Kingdom of God will be utilized to a considerable extent in the chapters on sectarianism and liberalism. The description and evaluation of influential books will occupy much of our attention in connection with sectarianism, transformationism and liberalism—especially the latter motif.

---

[1] Personal conversation, Chicago, Ill., December 7, 1956.

From these four methods the present writer will seek to find the most plausible and most probable explanation of the origin and nature of the Rauschenbusch social ethics. In subsequent pages evidence will be offered to permit this as one possible interpretation of his ethical thinking.

This total approach is needed for our basic argument: the study of origins is necessary to understand Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God ethics in terms of his unique selection and appropriation of materials from the four basic motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism.

CHAPTER I

THE CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

The chronological development of Walter Rauschenbusch's thought is not a simple one--two--three matter. In general, there are four elements of influence--pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. These influences are operative almost from the beginning. To be sure, it is an uneven and unequal operation. Pietism and Anabaptism are there in a marked way during the earlier days with liberalism and transformationism forging ahead somewhat later. Yet, even this distinction needs some qualification against the background of his father, August Rauschenbusch, in whom all these currents were operative in the previous generation. Perhaps the most accurate way to make this point is that the four influences were unevenly present throughout the American careers of August and Walter Rauschenbusch. There is an unmistakable interaction relationship among these factors. This interaction must be kept in mind as the chronological factors in Walter's life are set forth.

Broadly speaking, Walter Rauschenbusch's life can be divided into four periods: childhood, youth, New York pastorate and Rochester teaching ministry. Under these general headings, one can indicate the major experiences of his life which mediated his outlook on Christian social ethics. Before undertaking this survey, it will be well to review the materials in connection with August Rauschenbusch. This is the prologome, the parental prologome for Walter's career.

In his presidential address to the American Society of Church History in 1954 Professor Carl E. Schneider views August Rauschenbusch as a representative type: "A person who in an unusually vital way and dynamic way reflected religious and cultural tensions within and between German and American movements of the day. We begin with a Rauschenbusch struggling through the phenomenal gamut of nineteenth-century German rationalism, romanticism, orthodoxy, confessionalism, ecclesiasticism and emerging from this conflict a radical pietist."[1] Schneider then sees the continuation of the story with "a Rauschenbusch projected into the maze of the nineteenth-century American Christianity bearing on it the earmarks of the Puritan heritage. We conclude with a Rauschenbusch emerging from this interpenetration of German and American traditions with a sense of freedom and emancipation which we shall refer to as his Americanization."[2]

The clearest thing emerging from Professors Schneider's fresh study of August Rauschenbusch is the complexity of the man. With five generations of Lutheran pastors behind him, one is tempted to see a simple continuum of Augsburg confessionalism here. Or, with the appearance of the radical pietism, one is again tempted to see a singular thrust of a powerful movement which effected the Continent, Great Britain and America. Yet this tendency to oversimplify must be set aside as Schneider shows so convincingly. As a matter of fact, Professor Schneider actually left out a major factor in the development of August Rauschenbusch, namely, his encounter with the Anabaptists and the Mennonites. This factor complicates the story to the extent of adding a dimension, a fact that needs to be brought in at this point. Walter Rauschenbusch himself documents his fathers deep interest in sectarian research in the biography, Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch.[3] The most revealing aspect of this interest was a trip to Germany in 1868-69 after his appointment to the German Baptist seminary faculty in Rochester. The purpose of this trip was to gather material for a history of the Anabaptist movement. He visited Waldshut, a town in Lower Austria where Balthasar Hübmaier had preached and where the Peasants Revolt had broken out. Also, he went to key universities such as Freiburg, Zürich and Basel, seeking the remains of Waldensian and Anabaptist literature. With true scholarly concern for primary sources he made copies of many original documents and other rare publications. August Rauschenbusch also sought out scholars who could help him in understanding the left-wing of the Reformation. These individuals include a learned Catholic priest in Waldshut, three Catholic professors at Ulm, Professor Schreiber of Freiburg and, above all, the leading Anabaptist scholar of his day, Professor C. W. Cornelius of Münich. Even before this encounter, Cornelius had published during the years 1855-60 a source book on the Anabaptist of Leipzig with the title, Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhr in drei Buchern. This book was read by both August and Walter Rauschenbusch who thereby started with the most learned expert on Anabaptistica in the nineteenth century.[1] His works still appear in basic bibliographies in this area of interest.

---

[1] Carl E. Schneider, "The Americanization of Walter Rauschenbusch," Church History, XXIV, 3.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Walter Rauschenbusch, Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch (Kassel: J. G. Oncken, 1901), p. 221.

As decisive proof that Walter Rauschenbusch did utilize the research launched by his father, there is the simple fact that Walter translated and then published in the American Journal of Theology in Chicago, 1905, a letter of Conrad Grebel to his friends at Zürich. This letter was included in Professor Cornelius' collection previously referred to.

As a matter of fact, the Rauschenbusch labors in sectarian research were so well known in Mennonite circles that the outstanding Mennonite encyclopedia in the world, the Mennotischen Lexikon, published a biographical essay on August Rauschenbusch by Dr. Ernst Crous, former state librarian in Berlin. This article also indicates that August Rauschenbusch visited the Mennonites of Ontario where he was attracted by their moral earnestness and Biblical mentality but was repulsed by their lack of missionary spirit and lack of clear proof of conversion.

---

[1] An examination of this sourcebook reveals a rich array of primary sources in Anabaptism studies. In the second book dealing with Anabaptism there are forty important historical items similar to Grebel's letter.

For all these reasons, Professor Schneider should have added an additional dimension to the already complex list of factors operating in August Rauschenbusch as a representative type. That dimension is sectarian. Therefore, Walter Rauschenbusch represents a second generation orientation in sectarian research. This factor is a basic foundation for his career as ethical prophet and church historian. The chapter of this thesis on Walter Rauschenbusch as Sectarian Radical documents the ways in which he utilized the sectarian motif.

In addition to the impact of August Rauschenbusch as complex representative nineteenth-century Protestant, German-American upon Walter Rauschenbusch there are several other important characteristics mediated through him to his son. In this long line of Westphalian Lutherans there is both educational excellence and a general pattern of brilliance. The fact that August Rauschenbusch attended Berlin and Bonn universities is a fairly commonplace development in the Rauschenbusch Freundschaft. Under parental tutorship he began Latin at six, French at seven and Greek at eight. At the age of fifteen, in the Elberfeld Gymnasium, he added English and Hebrew to the list of languages which a prospective candidate needed to master before admission to the university. When he left for Berlin University at the age of eighteen he was following a familiar family pattern rather than initiating the pattern which only too often is the case with young men of pietistic background who enter the ministry even today in America. August Rauschenbusch's father was a scholarly man whose book, Biblische Historien ran through over a hundred editions and was in use as late as 1895 in the public schools of Frankfort on the Main.

This legacy of a cultured, gifted family committed to the learned ministry very likely made it quite impossible for Walter Rauschenbusch to fall into the pattern of anti-intellectualism which was capturing the citadels of pietism. And, what is more, it opened the doors to the rationalism and romanticism of the Enlightenment in view of the fact that Walter Rauschenbusch spent ten years in Germany.

In connection with the Enlightenment, mention ought to be made of the fact that August Rauschenbusch came to America in 1846, just two years before the ill-fated revolution of 1848. He was deeply moved by the democratic fervor of the student movement. His brother, Wilhelm, sacrificed professional status to defend one hundred of the arrested students with his skill as a lawyer. Therefore, the dialectical movement of pre-Walter Rauschenbusch motifs moving toward a social gospel include: the moral earnestness of pietism, the ethical radicalism of sectarianism, the political ethics of the democratic enthusiasm of 1848 and the rationalistic idealism and culture of the Enlightenment in a family of gifted, learned ministers accustomed to reflective thought, linguistic tools, extensive travel and literary expression. Surely few notable figures come to their moment of historical destiny with such a rich preparation. Walter Rauschenbusch is not a mutation. Walter Rauschenbusch is rather the climax and fruition of forces and factors well underway in his father and partly underway in his forebearers four generations earlier. This is chronological fact number one. In order to make sure that all this is clearly related to specific periods of time, the following outline of August Rauschenbusch's career is given:

1. Born: 1816, Altena, Westphalia, Germany
2. Enters Berlin University: 1834 (Age 18)
3. Assumes Altena Pastorate: 1841 (Age 25)
4. Migrates to America: 1846 (Age 30)

5. Becomes Baptist: 1856 (Age 40)
6. Appointed to Rochester Faculty: 1858 (Age 42)
7. Trip to Europe for Anabaptist Research: 1868-69 (Age 52)
8. Died 1899: (Age 83)

Turning now to Walter Rauschenbusch, it will be helpful to present a simple outline of his career along with the chronological outline of the Social Gospel as given in C. H. Hopkin's The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestanism.

RAUSCHENBUSCH	HOPKINS: SOCIAL GOSPEL
I. Childhood: 1861-1879 A. Education up to Gymnasium	I. Birth of Social Christianity: 1865-1880
II. Youth: 1879-1886 A. Gymnasium through Seminary	II. A Youthful Movement: 1880-1890
III. New York Pastorate: 1886-97 A. Interrupted by European Trip, 1891-92	III. The Social Gospel Comes of Age: 1890-1900
IV. Rochester Teaching and Intensive Social Gospel Leadership: 1897-1918	IV. Maturity and Recognition: 1900-1915

In utilizing Professor Hopkins' outline, it is not necessary to endorse the dubious conception that social concern arose in the latter half of the nineteenth century. This outline obviously ignores the vigorous social concerns of the Puritans as early as the seventeenth century. In the more specialized use of the term the outline does indicate the remarkable parallels between Rauschenbusch's career and general development of the social message of the Protestant churches in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At the same time, it also makes clear that his real impact came during the years of "Maturity and Recognition," 1900-1915. Indeed, in Christianizing the Social Order he pays tribute to Washington Gladden, Josiah Strong and Richard T. Ely as the pioneers of social thought a quarter of a century ahead of him. Gladden, for example, was exactly twenty-five years older than Rauschenbusch and died in the same year, 1918.

Another way of making this same point is to indicate that Rauschenbusch's three greatest books were written in 1907 (Christianity and the Social Crisis), 1912 (Christianizing the Social Order) and 1917 (A Theology for the Social Gospel). This, once again, is the period of Maturity and Recognition.

If this has assisted in placing his work in perspective, we are now ready to look at the crucial developments in the four phases of his life.

I. Childhood, Education up to Gymnasium: Pietist Nurture, Classical Education, International Travel and General Cultural Sophistication, 1861-1879

The birth of Walter Rauschenbusch was interpreted by his family in rigorously pietistic terms. The new baby was under damnation and a candidate for grace. The family had regular worship and Bible study. The children were prepared for a crisis conversion experience which came to Walter at the age of seventeen. Even after he had passed beyond the theological framework in which this conversion took place, he cherished it as a deeply moving experience. This pietism was mediated both through the American and the German streams. In America the family of August Rauschenbusch was immediately located in the German Baptist fellowship. There was a wider fellowship among all the German pietists including the Kirchenverein des Westens in which the Niebuhrs were nurtured. The latter group representing the impact of the Basel mission, the outthrust of European pietism to German immigrants in America. In addition, Walter Rauschenbusch went with his mother and the other children to Germany for four years, between 1865-69.

The childhood experience in Germany not only confirmed the American pietism but also laid the foundations in travel, education and esthetics of the cultural sophistication which was so essentially un-pietistic. In the most impressionable years of three to seven, young Walter had a delightful experience of European travel and beauty.

Toward the latter part of this childhood visit to Germany, Walter's father came to complete some projects of his own and then to return to America with the family. Even at this early date, Walter was aware that his father was doing research on the sectarians, recording the following:

> In July Father went to South Germany and Switzerland partly to study up the history of the Baptists, which he then meant to write some time.[1]

Continuing Walter shows something of the happy mood of his family:

> When our vacation came, in August, we joined Father in the Black Forest. We stayed at a simple bathing beach called Freiers Beach, and had a happy time there. We made excursions, climbed the mountains, played by the brooks, and I hunted butterflies with a net, after the fashion of little German boys. I caught my first fish in the brook with my hand. Later on we made a tour on foot with Father to the Donau Springs beyond Donau-Eschingen.[2]

Back in the States, Walter entered Pfafflin's Private school in Rochester and stayed there except for one year in the Free Academy. He took the classical curriculum and soon showed unusual linguistic gifts. His two closest friends were not pietists. In fact one of them (Ed Hanna) later became the Roman Archbishop of San Francisco. Indeed, during these earliest years, August Rauschenbusch observed liberal tendencies in his son and threatened to expel him from Sunday School because he exercised independent judgment in religious thought.[3]

In looking over these early years through high school one notes the influence of pietism, sectarianism and idealism. The pietism is the major force. But, even as a child Walter knew something of his father's concern to uncover the historical roots of his Baptist background. With regard to liberal idealism, the story of these early years sounds much like the pattern of an upper class, old-line, well-to-do American family of the Eastern seaboard, stressing classical education, travel and cultural delights. The sheer delight in the natural phenomena of nature, the rigors of language study, and the stimulus of travel with a circle of friends well outside the strictly pietist conventicle--all these were laying the foundations for a liberal outlook on life quite in contrast to the constricted cultural vision of pietism.

---

[1] D. R. Sharpe, Walter Rauschenbusch (New York: Macmillan Company, 1942), p. 37.

[2] Ibid. [3] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 41.

The only missing element from these early years was the Calvinist and Catholic transformationist vision. Implicit in some of these other experiences were convictions which could work into this outlook: the quest for religious reality in pietism, the awareness of his father's search for Anabaptist materials, the liberal cultural development with its love of beauty. In the New York pastorate one of his real shocks was the ghastly ugliness and bleak emptiness of industrial capitalism. Explicit transformationism was to come later, perhaps through these implied beginnings.

II. Higher and Graduate Education, the Period of Youth Gymnasium through Rochester Theological Seminary: 1879-1886

After finishing the classical grade school and high school training (to use American terms) in outstanding private schools and one year of public school, Walter Rauschenbusch went to Germany for what was essentially his college education. Any serious analysis of his development must take cognizance of the fact that his liberal arts training was fundamentally in the context of late nineteenth-century German university life.

In 1879 he entered the Evangelical Gymnasium of Gütersloh in Westphalia. As is the case in European life, this was primarily an encounter with classical, Biblical and modern languages. He mastered these languages, writing many letters to his parents in English, German script, Greek and Latin. Also he showed early distinction in scholarship, rising to the top of his class: Primus Omnium!

At the same time he was having many highly stimulating travel experiences and contacts of the most sophisticated kind with artists, poets, writers and scholars. His father considered travel one of the chief sources of his education and kept him supplied with money for this purpose. The young student visited Leipzig, Jena, Berlin, Bonn, Cologna and many others. He read Plato, Sophocles and Norse mythology. All in All, Walter underwent a tremendous awakening.

After he finished his studies at Gütersloh in 1883, he entered Berlin university where he studied under Mommsen, Curtius and other leading figures. He was moved by the art treasures in Berlin and Dresden. Indeed, his art interests were very serious and increasingly developed.

His letters during this phase of his life breathe the spirit of the Renaissance and of the Enlightenment. He is bubbling over with the hedonistic delights of art, travel, study and keen conversation.

He returned home by way of England, stopping at London, Oxford and Liverpool. Soon after his return he registered simultaneously for the senior year at the University of Rochester and the junior year of the Seminary. In addition, he signed up for extra courses in everything from Septuagint Greek to Zoology. With his brilliant educational background, this double, even triple assignment was quite possible. On schedule he received the A. B. degree from Rochester in 1884, the diploma from the German department in 1885, and the B. D. from the English seminary (later Colgate-Rochester) in 1886.

It is during his seminary education that he studied under his father and received a systematic treatment of the left-wing groups of the Reformation. It was during his Seminary career that he experienced his second major religious development. At the age of seventeen he had experienced conversion. During his study in Germany he decided to enter the ministry--the year was 1882. The second major experience has been called his discipleship experience and came in 1886. After his conversion he resolved to "preach and save souls."[1] After the discipleship experience he added a new dimension to life.

"I wanted to do hard work for God," Rauschenbusch said. "Indeed one of the great thoughts that came upon me was that I ought to follow Jesus Christ in my personal life, and die over again his death. I felt that every Christian ought to participate in the dying of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in that way help to redeem humanity and it was that thought that gave my life its fundamental direction in the doing of Christian work."[2]

Both Walter Rauschenbusch and his biographer, Dores Sharpe believe that this discipleship experience was basic in pointing him toward larger social concerns since it moved him out from the soul-manicuring subjectivism of pietism into the more historical, more objective, more radical aspects of discipleship. This discipleship was integrated with liberalism and transformationism. It was the Rauschenbusch formula for the social gospel.

During the American educational phase of his career he had a very important summer pastorate for two terms in Louisville, Kentucky. These were the summers of 1884 and 1885. It was during these summer pastorates that pietism, sectarian discipleship and liberalism were clearly mixed together. And it was this basic trilogy which he would take to New York's Hell's Kitchen and discover the need for transformationism as well as for some of the more radical aspects of sectarianism.

After the first summer he was ready to abandon his hopes to be a literarily effective theologian infavor of a pastor "powerful with men preaching to them Christ as the man in whom their affections and energies can find satisfaction for which mankind is groaning."[3]

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 57.

[2] Sharpe, ibid.,p. 57.

[3] Sharpe, ibid., p. 55.

At the end of the second summer he reveals the interesting combination of sobriety, discipleship and liberal independence:

> Unselfishness and self-sacrifice seem to me the idea of Christ's life and therefore the expression of God's character. In proportion as they become dominant facts of our own life, we are conformed to his image. I tell you I am just beginning to believe in the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, not exactly in the shape in which the average person proclaims it as the infallible truth of the Most High, but in a shape that suits my needs, that I have gradually constructed for myself in studying the person and teaching of Christ, and which is still in rapid progress of constuction. I don't believe that believing any doctrine will do a man any good except so far as it is translated into life. I don't believe that a man believes in the vicarious death of Christ that death will be imputed to him; how can it? But if he begins to live a Christ-like life, he will find that though there is no Cross for him to be nailed to, he will die piecemeal by self-sacrifice just as Christ did even before his crucifixion and then he is at one with Christ and placed by God into the same category.[1]

It is precisely this kind of outlook which caused him to be rejected for an appointment as head of a seminary in India under the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society. His own professor of Old Testament objected to his views on the Bible. He was also rejected for a prominent pulpit in Springfield, Illinois. Out of these rejections he went to Hell's Kitchen in New York. Here was the final anvil on which his ultimate position was to be hammered out.

III. New York Pastorate, the Collapse of Pietistic Individualism, the Kingdom Theology, Discovery of New Friends and Allies, Encounter with Idealism in Politics and Economics: 1886-1897

Being thrust into the pathologies of American industrial-urban capitalism of the nineteenth century would test the resiliency of any position. No one could speak glibly in the face of such demonic wrong-doing wrought out in complex institutional patterns. Above all this was true for a sensitive, honest person like Walter Rauschenbusch. Yet it is false to see something in the human scene in Hell's Kitchen, New York City, 1886, which automatically brought about changes in patterns of thought and behaviour. There were other pietists, in New York. Many, indeed, most of them were not particularly changed. The real point is that Walter Rauschenbusch had already changed and came to New York with a unique trilogy of influences, pietist, sectarian and liberal.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

The historical situation brought the challenge. The major interpretative response to this historical situation was the floodtide of liberalized transformationism as symbolized by Henry George and Edward Bellamy and the liberalized sectarianism of Richard Heath. It is debatable as to whether a Henry George is more a child of the Enlightenment than he is a child of American puritan evangelicalism. The content of what he said was strongly liberal with the dynamic perhaps stemming from the distinctly religious roots. Richard Heath was clearly in touch with Continental sectarianism in both scholarly and functional terms. In any case, Walter Rauschenbusch's background permitted him to accept much of George and Heath as a proper interpretation of what it meant to have a Christian church in New York City and what it meant to be a Christian in New York City, late nineteenth century.

At this point in 1891 Walter Rauschenbusch did a very characteristic and understandable thing. While he is trying quite desparately to put the pieces together in the midst of the New York situation, he dropped everything and went to Europe for nine months! As a pietist he might have relied solely on prayer for guidance. As a multi-cultural German-American, as a child of Continental sectarianism, as a child of the Enlightenment, and as a step-child of transformationism he needed to probe further into the meaning of capitalism and industrialism. Therefore, in the midst of this heroic pastorate he did the characteristic Rauschenbusch thing, namely, consult the European mind. Thus, on March 14, 1891, he sailed for Europe. H was exactly thirty years of age and was approaching the final synthesis of his thought. He was making his third trip abroad. He was destined to make one more.

Most of the time he studied New Testament and sociology in Berlin. During this 1891 junket the Kingdom of God motif dawns with powerful and decisive effect, integrating, linking and organizing what was already there. From this time on Rauschenbusch has an organizing center for all that he says and does.

In addition, he investigated the Salvation Army, the cooperative movement and Fabian Socialism in England, the latter through the good offices of Beatrice and Sidney Webb. The English investigation convinced him that the welfare-relief-service approach was not enough. He was pointed in the direction of far-reaching social change and reconstruction, particularly with the yeast of Fabian socialism in his thinking.

It is difficult to tell to what extent he encountered Christian socialism, either British or Continental, on this trip. There is some circumstantial evidence to indicate that he did discover Maurice and Kingsley since both are mentioned in his first book, Christianity and the Social Crisis, the first draft of which was prepared on this trip.[1] Though he worked on this book in 1891 it was not published until ten years after his arrival in Rochester as a teacher, specifically, 1907. Since Maurice and Kingsley preceded Rauschenbusch by roughly fifty years and since Ragaz and Kutter were essentially contemporaries, it appears that Contiential Christian socialism was discovered on his last trip to Europe in 1907-1908, when he was awaiting the storm blown up by his first book on social questions.

Rauschenbusch came back to his parish December 24, 1891 and stayed six years. During this time Leighton Williams and Nathanial Schmidt replaced Munson Ford and Ed Hanna as his close friends. These new friends in the social gospel joined him in producing the provocative publication, For the Right and in organizing a conventicle of social concern, the Brotherhood of the Kingdom.

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 69.

The Brotherhood of the Kingdom had a definite sectarian foundation in that the members were to "exemplify obedience to the ethics of Jesus in his personal life" and "propagate the thought of Jesus to the limits of his ability in private conversation, by correspondence, and through pulpit, platform and press."[1]

He publicly defended his friend Nathaniel Schmidt from charges of heresy when he was ejected from Hamilton seminary on the Colgate University campus. He argued that a creedless denomination devoted to the Bible must defend the new liberal wing of the denomination as having the right to speak just as the conservatives have the right to speak.

As a curious pietistic interlude during this time, he was the co-author with Ira Sankey of a new translation of American gospel hymns into the German language. Most of this material appeared in 1897, the final year of his New York pastorate.

The basic fact is that the Walter Rauschenbusch who went to Rochester as seminary teacher in 1897 had reached final ground in his position. When in New York he had seen the necessity of transforming the entire social order into the image of Jesus, a mixture of Puritan and sectarian ideas, and of moving into a more aggressive position generally. In ten years Walter Rauschenbusch had fully prepared himself for his definitive formulation of the social gospel. Pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationist Calvinism and transformationist Catholicism were all present. Teaching and writing plus a large encounter with social life in Rochester and social movements outside Rochester would be the next frontiers.

IV. Rochester Teaching, Intensive Social Gospel Leadership and Premature Death: 1897-1918

From one point of view the removal from New York City was the loss of an intensively activist context which was a great handicap to Rauschenbusch.

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 122.

On the other hand, Rochester, New York, a middle sized city proved to be a and stimulating situation where the social gospel came to the fore quite early, providing a real outlet for his concerns. There were liberal movements, labor forums, socialist groups, reform organizations, and institutional churches. Social and political developments were varied and generally stimulating. Above all, he had many lecture outlets which contributed to his ability to refine and clarify the conceptions of his social concern. Rather complete freedom was provided and the press gave generous coverage to his speeches, several of which have been utilized in the present study.

Rauschenbusch's career in Rochester is divided into two parts. From 1897 to 1902 he was connected with the German department of the Seminary, teaching New Testament as well as typical liberal arts subjects such as government, zoology, English and natural sciences. In this connection he published, Die Politische Verfassung Unseres Landes, a handbook for German-Americans on American government. The second phase began in 1902 when he became professor of church history in Rochester Theological Seminary, continuing in this chair until his death in 1918.

During his teaching career it is clear that he achieved great distinction and real effectiveness. Moreover, it is during this church history phase of his career that he delineated in his lectures the role of the Anabaptists and, to some extent, that of the Puritans. This fact is documented more fully in other chapters. But the references to left-wing Protestantism are frequent, being fully confirmed by those former students of his who tried to recall and summarize the actual emphasis in the classroom apart from the references in his writings. In this knowledge of left-wing materials he seemed to be well ahead of the general consensus in professional historical circles since a working knowledge of the Anabaptists has not been available to most American historians until quite recent years.

In addition, Rauschenbusch traveled widely, lectured frequently including four major lectureships, the Earl, Merrick, Gates and Taylor. He also worked very actively in both the Baptist congresses and the Federal Council of Churches. Since the Federal Council's orgins follow his career rather closely (it was founded in 1908, one year after his first great book) he had an important role in starting it.

No doubt it is the books of Walter Rauschenbusch combined with lecturing, teaching and organizing which really catapulted him to fame. His first book was released with so much fear and trepedation that he went off to Europe--good, familiar, hospitable Europe--to await the attack. Instead of attack the response was essentially friendly if not highly enthusiastic.

Rauschenbusch wrote with an excellent style in both German and English. Among modern ethics writers using English only John Bennett can be compared to him. Vida Scudder notes his exceptional command of sardonic speech. Sharpe lauds his mastery of the short sentence and his memorable similes, often whimsical.

He had a superb education, far superior to that of most Americans. Out of this background came well documented books, a feeling for history, a fearlessness with truth and a general thoroughness. With the spirit of the Enlightenment, he had a tendency toward syncretism and a looseness with theological language which made it easy for him to telescope highly varying conceptions.

It seems conceivable that on his last trip to the Continent in 1907 he made the acquaintance of Ragaz and Kutter whose works are cited in *Christianizing the Social Order*, published in 1912. The full list of his books in English is as follows:

Christianity and the Social Crisis, 1907

Prayers of the Social Awakening, 1910

Christianizing the Social Order, 1912

Unto Me, 1912

Dare We Be Christians?, 1914

Social Principles of Jesus, 1916

A Theology for the Social Gospel, 1917

All were written during his career at Rochester Theological Seminary, 1902-1918. They were published during a brilliant eleven-year period of creativity.

Although this literary creativity was climaxed in his Taylor lectures at Yale, in what many believe to be his most effective lectureship and book, the latter part of his life was tragic and sombre. He died in 1918 as World War I ended. There were many reasons why these years were difficult. America was swept with real anti-German hysteria which caused everything from Wagnerian opera to plain German backgrounds to be suspect. A man named Rauschenbusch who had spent ten years of his life in Germany and had reason to be deeply attached to German culture was naturally suspect. In addition, he had pacifist tendencies which were finally climaxed by his joining the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Also, he was naturally an internationalist hardly capable of the crudities of nationalistic hysteria.

With friends rejecting him, with history proving to be tragic and tough he fell from genuine popularity to the grim Lincolnesque statement: "Since 1914 the world is full of hate, and I cannot expect to be happy in my lifetime."[1] Added to all this was another tragic experience which serves to remind us of our mortality and weakness in the face of the last enemy to be conquered: he experienced the killing disease of cancer. Late in May, 1918, at the Johns Hopkins hospital in Baltimore he passed away at the age of fifty-seven. Washington Gladden died the same year at the age of eighty-two.

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 356.

Had Rauschenbusch lived, there would have been encounter with postwar life and thought. This would have made a difference. But it was his lot to be born during the Civil War and to die during World War I. In this parenthesis of wars was more tragedy than he fully realized. Walter Rauschenbusch nonetheless lived creatively with enough vitality to make his writing and labor relevant to our current studies.

CHAPTER II

THE INFLUENCE OF PIETISM

The attempt to understand Rauschenbusch as an evangelical has obscured and overlooked the much more clear-cut and identifiable influence of pietism. Through his father, Walter Rauschenbusch was influenced by one of the most powerful post-Reformation Christian movements which arose in seventeenth-century Germany and then exerted great power in England and America. From one viewpoint, evangelicalism and pietism are synonymous: the emphasis on regeneration, devotional exercises and evangelism. In a number of countries, however, the term evangelical is used to distinguish Protestants from Catholics. In England it tends to be synonymous with "low church." In America many fundamentalists use the term evangelical as less odious than fundamentalism. Others eqviate it with the Great Awakening in eighteenth-century America.[1] It seems, therefore, more precise to study the origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics, in the first instance, by reference to the term and to the movement of pietism. The term as defined in our introduction denotes pietism as a distinct movement starting in Germany of the seventeenth century attacking Lutheran orthodox intellectualism and formalism in favor of a personal, devotional, subjective, individualist, conversionist pattern of Christianity seeking vital religious experience and upright conduct.

Because Rauschenbusch's pietism collapsed during his New York City pastorate, one is tempted to write off this influence as of little impact. In terms of theological and ethical content this view might be justified. But if we take into account Rauschenbusch's fundamental attitudes and perspectives, it is a false approach. Some of the basic origins of Rauschenbusch's ethics are to be found in this legacy of pietism. It is here that doors will open into liberalism and sectarianism since there is an affinity between pietism and liberalism, and, pietism and sectarianism. It is here that a legacy of ecumenicity is found. It is here that creedalism is rejected in favor of experiential Christianity. It is here that a generally critical attitude toward conventional church life is developed. It is here that a compassion for people in welfare work is started. It is here that a feeling for political liberty is developed, as Ritschl points out in volume III of Geschichte des Pietismus in his discussion of the peculiar qualities of Wurttemburg pietism in which August Rauschenbusch was nurtured.[1]

---

[1] George W. Davis, "The Origin and Principles of Evangelical Christianity," Crozer Quarterly, XXII, 225.

Before pursuing the details of the encounter with pietism, let us discuss the methodological pattern for the demonstration of these points.

Of the four methods for demonstrating origins, family, Zeitgeist, self-image and books, it is clear that the family and Zeitgeist are the most influential. His father climaxed his pietist pilgrimage by migration to America in 1846 at the age of thirty and by his entrance into the Baptist church ten years later at the age of forty. August Rauschenbusch's pietist pilgrimage reflects part of the German Zeitgeist where Enlightenment rationalism was in serious conflict with the old orthodoxy and the new pietism. After much struggle with orthodoxy and rationalism he emerges a convinced pietist. Therefore, the origins of Rauschenbusch's ethics must be sought by surveying the pilgrimage of August Rauschenbusch in the setting of nineteenth-century Germany.

Walter Rauschenbusch was conscious of himself as a pietist in his earlier years particularly. As we shall see, his conversion was consciously understood in those terms. His membership in the German Baptist church likewise provided a climate of pietism up to the days of his shift into the English-speaking Rochester Seminary from the German-speaking Baptist Seminary. Some of his feeling for the Kingdom-motif emerges from this background in explicitly pietistic nurture.

---

[1] Ritschl, op. cit., III, 3-159.

In terms of books the evidence for pietistic influence is very sparse. Walter Rauschenbusch's early German-Baptist writings in the Jugend Herold are simple Biblical expositions without footnotes. In any case, his early education was classical and sophisticated rather than devotional and pietistic. As a mature writer he no longer operates in the literary contexts of pietism.

The demonstration of origins, therefore, is primarily through the impact of his family as it reflected part of the German Zeitgeist.

The most recent and authoritative study of August Rauschenbusch is that of Professor Carl E. Schneider of Eden Theological Seminary. It was his presidential paper to the American Church History Society in 1954 on "The Americanization of August Rauschenbusch." Professor Schneider's life-long interest has been in the German migrations to America, particularly those of the German pietists. His study is essentially a study of the role of pietism in the spiritual development of August Rauschenbusch.

What is more important Professor Schneider based much of his paper on twenty-two hitherto unavailable and unpublished letters of August Rauschenbusch during crucial American years from 1845-1854. They were discovered by Schneider in the archives of the Rhenish Missionary Institute, Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany and were made available to the present writer in the Eden Theological Seminary archives. In addition, the doctoral disseration of David Georg Gelzer, Mission to America; Being a History of the Work of the Basel Foreign Missions Society in America (Yale, 1952) sheds much new light on the basic pietistic context out of which the Rauschenbusch name emerged on the American Protestant and cultural scene. Likewise, it sheds much light on the background of the Niebuhr family indicating that both Rauschenbusch and the Niebuhrs are, in some sense, children of pietism; both are children of German-American culture; both are second generation Americans and both are conversant with American and European currents of thought. In the latter was to be found an emerging Enlightenment liberalism as well as its corrective, for the Niebuhrs, in crisis theology.

Professor Schneider views August Rauschenbusch as a representative type: "A person who in an unusually vital and dynamic way reflected religious and cultural tensions within and between German and American movements of the day. We begin with a Rauschenbusch struggling through the phenomenal gamut of nineteenth-century German rationalism, romanticism, orthodoxy, confessionalism, ecclesiasticism, and emerging from this conflict, a radical Pietist."[1]

Schneider then sees the continuation of the story with "a Rauschenbusch projected into the maze of nineteenth-century American Christianity bearing on it the earmarks of the Puritan heritage. We conclude with a Rauschenbusch emerging from this interpenetration of German and American traditions with a sense of freedom and emancipation which we shall refer to as his 'Americanization.' "[2]

Thus, Schneider presents a well documented picture of August Rauschenbusch going through four phases: retionalist, pietist, pietist-puritan, and Baptist. The emergence into a radical pietism took place in 1834 toward the end of his theological studies at the University of Berlin. The usual stereotypes of pietism were present: a black and white world with a sharp sense of lostness, the rejection of worldly practices such as art and the theatre, a demand for conscious conversion, and high standards for church membership beyond catechism and confirmation. All this, of course, took place in a subjectivistic experiential context.

---

[1] See also Schneider's "The German Church on the American Frontier," Church History, XXIV, No. 1 (March, 1955), 3.

[2] Schneider, ibid., p. 3.

The early feeling for ethical issues of a larger sort was August Rauschenbusch's assistance in the establishment of a temperance society in Altena in the Prussian province of Westphalia where he was the sixth in a direct line of Lutheran pastors with pietistic leanings.

The startling decision of August Rauschenbusch to come to America was defended as a revelation of God's will. In addition he insisted that he Kingdom of God took primacy over any ecclesiastical loyalties. This posed the question of his auspices for coming. Once again the pietist context of his outlook on life was evident. He applied to the Langenberg society, a product of the Württembergian pietism. It may be recalled that this center of pietism developed from the work of Spener into a movement which had very little political and ecclesiastical opposition. And, in addition, the Württemberger pietists were friendly to the Moravians. In any case, it was a biblicist and inter-confessional pietism which sent him to America.

He arrived here in 1846, just two years before the famous band of politically liberal German refugees, the so-called Forty-Eighters. The spectre of American sectarianism greeted him upon arrival. After a narrow anti-Methodist encounter his pietistic inter-confessional spirit broke through and he found the American Home Missionary Society, the semi-Presbyterian and Congregational society, for reaching Germans in the West. He also worked with the American Tract Society.

American activism was an early experience, testing his pietist soul. In January, 1846, he wrote a letter to W. Colsman in Langenberg, saying, "You know that in America all activity including the spiritual proceed as though driven by steam. . . . Here is no place for solitary life or studies."[1]

---

[1] Rauschenbusch correspondence in Eden Theological Seminary archives.

His inter-denominational spirit is revealed in a letter to Germany in October 22, 1846,: "God has given me a free evangelical spirit to seek and to find his children under all sorts of names and forms. I've brought them with me from Germany and propose to maintain it here to do my part to reduce walls of division between the various denominations or parties that may finally break down."[1]

After itinerating for the aforementioned societies, Rauschenbusch went to the Mt. Sterling, Missouri, Baptist church because he believed that the Baptists had a deeper comprehension of the Kingdom of God. The birth of his first son there April 24, 1857, caused him to write this pietist description of the event:

> I know you will be happy to hear the news on April 24th that there was born to my wife a strong boy. Mother and child are thus far getting along very well.
>
> You may well imagine that we look upon this son as a welcome and worthy gift from God. If you would show me a kindness, then pray (not often, not daily, not ceaselessly, no, pray) only once that God might bless my son, who has inherited nothing from me but sin, death and damnation, and allow him to inherit life and salvation in Christ; so that he may not become a hell rake (Hollenbrand) toward which he already has all the tendencies, thanks to his parents, but a child of grace and an heir of heaven, and if it please God, may he in his day become a fruitful representative of truth in this false and untruthful world.[2]

If the familiar pietistic view of conversion was present so also were the familiar ecumenical spirit and the practical ethical concerns. The first record book of his church at Mt. Sterling, Missouri, (locally known as the Pin Oak church) includes the following anti-slavery affirmation:

> The first business meeting of the Pin Oak Creek Baptist Church was held Jan 18, 1856 in the home of Rev. August Rauschenbusch, pastor, who opened the meeting with song, prayer and Scripture reading.
>
> Rev. Rauschenbusch and the group strongly opposed slavery. Passed: 'No slaveholder can ever be a member or be a Communicant of this Church.' "[3]

---

[1] Rauschenbusch correspondence, Eden Theological Seminary archives.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The Pin Oak Creek Baptist Church, Gasconade County, Mt. Sterling, Mo., first record book, Eden archives.

According to this rule, then, anti-slavery became a test of membership. August Rauschenbusch became eloquent in his critique of slavery, urging Germans to come to Missouri because this would lessen the possibility of slavery. Thus, the pietism of August Rauschenbusch did not deter him from entering into the greatest moral and political controversy of nineteenth-century America. Perhaps here was the more objective ethical dimension of the Rauschenbusch background which was a latent factor in Walter Rauschenbusch's earlier pietism; and, which under hard blows of New York City was destined to collapse.

Speaking of August Rauschenbusch, President A. H. Strong of Rochester Theological Seminary declared:

> A pietist of the biblical sort, he would have become a Puritan of the most rigid kind had he lived in those days. What he did he did well. It was of the utmost importance that the German Baptist churches came under the influence of such a man. He was a great man of God.[1]

Walter Rauschenbusch's pietistic legacy from his father includes the following:

1. A rejection of the ecclesiastical status quo in the State churches of Germany plus a rejection of rationalism in favor of a pietism which led to a missionary assignment in America under inter-denominational pietisic auspices. This eventually led August Rauschenbusch into a fully pietistic denomination, the German Baptists of North America, a very small part of the total Baptist community.

2. Partial rejection of confessional dogmatism in favor of religious experience through conscious conversion.

3. A criticism of the world expressed through a life of personal purity, a network of welfare institutions and schools and a selected, fragmentary number of social issues such as temperance and slavery.

---

[1] Charles F. Zummach, These Glorious Years, The Centenary History of the German Baptists of North America, 1843-1943 (Cleveland: Roger Williams Press, 1943), p. 69.

4. An inter-denominational, inter-confessional missionary spirit.

Walter Rauschenbusch was nurtured on this legacy of pietism, started his life pilgrimage with it, then found that it broke down in his New York parish. Yet some of the roots of his new position were in this pietism despite his sharp rejection of the total pattern.

Walter Rauschenbusch's conversion followed the normative pietist pattern. He had a sharp conversion experience at the age of seventeen in which he returned from the far country where he was tending hogs and came to his Heavenly Father. Of this experience he wrote:

> Such as it was, it was of everlasting value to me. It turned me permanently and I thank God with all my heart for it. It was a tender mysterious experience. It influenced my soul down to the depths. Yet, there was a great deal in it that was not really true.[1]

Biographer Sharpe also comments on this experience, saying that "through the years, as old ideas were sloughed off and new ones taken on, Rauschenbusch never lost the glow or the power of a vital, vivid, personal experience with the Living God."[2]

After his education he became pastor of the Second German Baptist Church of New York City, a church not affiliated with the Northern Baptist Convention but the distinctly German group now known as the North American Baptist Church. This pastorate was 1886-1897. For four of these years he was also editor of the Jugend Herold, a German language paper of his denomination. In addition, his earlier pietism is made clear in his role as translator of Gospel hymns into German.

One of the most impressive bits of evidence from this radically pietist phase of Rauschenbusch is his little known joint authorship with Ira Sankey of the revivalistic hymn-book, Evangeliums-Lieder 1 und 2 mit deutschen Kernliedern. The following hymns were translated by Walter Rauschenbusch:

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 43. [2] Ibid., p. 44.

1. Gott verheisst dir im Worte (Hallelujah 'Tis Done)
2. Ich brauch dich allezeit (I Need Thee Every Hour)
3. Wer da will (Whosoever Will)
4. Mein Jesu, gabst du denn (Something for Jesus)
5. Rettet die Irrenden (Rescue the Perishing), Fanny J. Crosby
6. Hin zum Kreuz (Near the Cross)
7. Heiland, mehr als Leben mir (Every Day and Hour)
8. Heute (Today)
9. Sieh', ich komme, Herr, zum Kreuz (I am Coming to the Cross)
10. Jesus führt mich allerwegen (All the Way my Saviour Leads Me), Fanny J. Crosby
11. Folg' night der Versuchung (Yield not to Temptation)
12. Komm, heil'ger Geist (Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove), Fanny J. Crosby
13. Zieh' mich näher (Draw me Nearer), Fanny J. Crosby
14. Auf zum Werk! (To the Work), Fanny J. Crosby
15. Will ich des Kreuzes Streiter sein? (Am I a Soldier of the Cross?)
16. O wo sind die Schnitter? (Oh, Where are the Reapers?)
17. Schaut, es dämmert (Hear the Call)
18. Er such auch dich (Seeking to Save)
19. Seh'n wir uns? (Shall we Meet?)
20. Heilig, heilig, heilig (Holy, holy! Lord God Almighty)
21. Mit dem Schatten seiner Hand (He will Hide Me)
22. Bist du müde? (Art Thou Weary?)
23. Preis dir, du ewiger (Come, Thou, Almighty King)
24. Wir pilgern nach Zion (We're Marching to Zion)
25. Nacht ist's; ein einz'ger heller Stern (Olive's Brow)
26. Krönt ign! (Crown him!)
27. Abendlied (Evening Prayer)
28. Komm! (Come)
29. Mich verlangt nicht nach Schatzen (Is my Name Written There?)
30. Herr, ich komme (I am Coming)
31. Schau' ich zu jenem Kreuze hin (When I Survey the Wondrous Cross)
32. Jesu, Heiland, fleu're du (Jesus, Saviour Pilot Me)
33. O wunderbar süss ist die Botschaft! (Redemption), Fanny J. Crosby
34. Kind Gottes, harre still und fein (O Child of God), Fanny J. Crosby
35. Jesus hilft (Jesus Saves)
36. Das Rettungseil (Throw out the Life-Line)
37. Nur voran (Lead Me On)
38. Wir war die Hälfte nie gesagt (I Know I Love Thee Better Lord)
39. Bist du rein durch das Blut? (Are you Washed in the Blood?)
40. Ich weiss, das mein Erlöser lebt (I know that my Redeemer Lives)
41. Nicht ferne vom Reiche Gottes (Not Far from the Kingdom)
42. Erben des Reichs (The Child of a King)
43. Gott ist Leben, Lieb' und Licht (Songs of Gladness)
44. Unter seiner Flügel Schutz (In the Shadow of His Wings)
45. Wach' auf, mein Herz (Loving Kindness)
46. Am Kreuz (At the Cross)
47. Ströme des Segens (There Shall be Showers of Blessings)
48. Ein starker Fels im wilden Sturm (A Shelter in Time of Storm)
49. Jesus lebt! (Christ Arose)
50. Kommt, ihr Sünder, arm und elend (Come, ye Sinners)
51. Murre nicht (Wait and Murmur Not)
52. Lass den Heiland ein! (Let the Saviour In!)
53. Nimm, wie ich bin (Take me as I Am)

54. Welche Scharen (What a Gathering), Fanny J. Crosby
55. Auf Widerseh'n (God be With you)
56. Nicht all' der Thiere Blut (Not all the Blood of Beasts)
57. Heil und Fried und Kraft (Pardon, Peace and Power)
58. Daheim im Port (Safe Home in Port)
59. Drum seik stark in dem Herrn (Be Ye Strong in the Lord)
60. Golgatha (Calvary)
61. Bringst sie herein (Gather Them in)
62. Heil dir, Jesu, einst verachtet! (Hail, Thou Once Despised Jesus)
63. Ich will folgen (Follow On!)
64. Jesu Kreuz, ist all' mein Rühmen (In the Cross of Christ I Glory)
65. Seele, auf, ich will's verkünden (I Will the Wondrous Story)
66. Der Heil'gen Zuflucht (God is the Refuge of His Saint)
67. Wär' gleich blutrot die Sünde (Though Your Sins Be as Scarlet)
68. Alles will ich, Herr, verlassen (Jesus, I my Cross Have Taken)
69. Ein völliges Heil (Abundantly Able to Save)
70. Das Banner des Kreuzes (The Banner of the Cross)
71. Komm, Sünder, komm (Come, Sinner, Come)
72. Vorwärts, Christi Streiter (Onward Christian Soldiers)
73. Abend wird es wieder (Now the Day is Over)
74. Weisser denn der Schnee (Blessed be the Fountain)
75. Sagt es laut, dass Gott die Liebe (God is Love!)
76. Sel'ge Amdachtszeit ('Tis the Blessed Hour of Prayer)
77. Wo is mein Kind whol jezt (Where is my Boy Tonight?)
78. Dir sing ich, Vaterland (My Country 'Tis of Thee)
79. Birg du mich (Hide Thou Me)
80. Heilig, heilig, ist der Herr (Holy, holy is the Lord)
81. Dein Wille, Herr, gescheh'! (My Jesu as Thou Wilt)
82. Jerusalem von Golde (Jerusalem the Golden)
83. Führe du uns, O Jehovah (Guide me, O Thou Great Jehovah)
84. O singt seiner Liebe Macht (Oh Sing of His Mighty Love)
85. Mit den Augen leit' ich dich (Precious Promise)
86. Ein Wort für Jesum (Just a Word for Jesus), Fanny J. Crosby
87. Tragt's hinaus in all Lande (Tell it Out)
88. O sehet, welche Liebe (Behold, What Love)
89. Jesu, und kann es möglich sein (Jesus and Shall It Ever Be)
90. Schöpfe tiefer (More to Follow)
91. Mein Kreuz (Blest Jesus, Grant us Strength)
92. Freie Gnad'! (Mercy's Free)
93. Einen Sünder wie Mich (A Sinner Like Me)
94. O Bruder, hab' Mut und sag' Nein (Have Courage, my Boy, to Say No)
95. Wie fest, o ihr Heiligen (How Firm a Foundation)
96. Einst hommt due Zeit (O Morning Land)
97. Freue dich, Welt (Joy to the World)
98. Ströme der Gnade (Hear us, O Saviour)
99. Es schall' mein lebenlang (His Praises I will Sing)
100. Harre, banges Herz (Hope on)
101. O ew'ger Felsen (O Rock of Ages)
102. Enge und schmal (Narrow and Strait)
103. Jesu, ich komm'! (To Thee I Come)
104. O teuer werte Botschaft (O Glad and Glorious Gospel)
105. Quell der Barmkerzigkeit (Christ the Fountain)
106. Heil'ger Geist (Holy Ghost, With Light Divine)
107. Tragt di frohe Botschaft (Preach the Gospel)
108. Nimm Zeit dir zur Andacht (Take Time to be Holy)

109. Wirst du? Werd' ich? (Shall you? Shall I?)
110. Zahllos wie der Sand an dem Strand (Numberless as the Sands)
111. Führe du dein Kind (Lead Me Saviour)
112. Komm, Geist des Vater's (Come Holy Spirit)
113. Sie, Warten schon am Thore (Waiting at the Door)
114. Preist mit mir den Gott der Stärke (I Will Praise Thee)
115. Will Ich des Kreuzes Streiter sein (Soldier of the Cross)
116. Habt ihr treulich gescuht? (Have You Sought?)
117. Wir möchten Jesum seh'n (We Would See Jesus)
118. Banges Herz, dein Gott dir rufet (He Died for Thee), Fanny J. Crosby
119. Ich hab' ein Heim (A Home on High)
120. Will das Oel im Krug verliegen (Is Thy Cause of Comfort Failing?)
121. Missionsled (Mission Hymn), Fanny J. Crosby
122. Der Glaube ist die Siegeskraft (Faith is the Victory)
123. Am abend, eh' die Sonne sank (At Even Ere Sun was Set)
124. Ja, am Morgen seh'n Wir Uns Wieder (Yes, We'll Meet in the Morning)
125. Herr, Prüfe mich (Search me, O Lord)
126. Auferstanden (Christ is Risen)
127. Herr Jesu, die sei Preis (When Morning Gilds the Skies)
128. Gottes, Gnad' ist unabsehbar (There's a Wideness in God's Mercy)
129. Auf grünen Auen (In Heavenly Pastures)
130. Eilet hin (Speed Away), Fanny J. Crosby
131. Ich weiss ein Land (There is a Land)
132. Er lebt und liebt (Our Saviour King)
133. Keinen Heiland (No Hope in Jesus)
134. Die Tage eilen hin (While the Days are Going By)
135. Es schreit der Hirsch (As Pants the Heart)
136. Liebe, wie gross! (Wonderful Love)
137. Was steht ihr Schnitter müssig? (Ho, Reapers of Life's Harvest)[1]

Rauschenbusch's career as hymnologist indicates that he was not limited to the American Gospel hymn. Yet it is true to say that, for the German Protestant immigrants, his labors of translation mediated the American pietist hymnology to them in its most lilting, superficial form. On the other hand, the radical shift away from pietism is seen in the list of his favorite hymns recorded in the Rauschenbusch memorial issue of The Rochester Theological Seminary Bulletin of 1918, the issue which gives the full transcript of his funeral and memorial services. Seven of his favorite hymns in the post-pietist phase of his career were: Gerhardt's "Befiehl du deine Wege,"; Bates's "O Beautiful for Spacious Skies,"; Elliott's "When Wilt Thou Save the People?";

---

[1] The Evangeliums-Lieder 1 und 2 was published in 1897, the last year of his New York pastorate, by Biglow & Main Co., New York and Chicago; and The John Church Co., Cincinnati, Chicago, and New York. Ira Sankey writes the forward.

Bernard of Cluny's "Jerusalem the Golden,"; G. K. Chesterton's "O God of earth and altar, Bow down and hear our cry,"; John Haynes Holmes' "God of the nations, near and far,"; Ballantine's "God Save America."

In the funeral service Conrad Henry Moehlman quoted Ballantine's hymn which was dedicated to Walter Rauschenbusch:

God save America, new world of glory
New-born to freedom and knowledge and power,
Lifting the towers of her lightning-lit cities
Where the flood tides of humanity roar!

God save America! Here may all races
Mingle together as children of God,
Founding an empire on brotherly kindness,
Equal in liberty, made of one blood!

God save America! Brotherhood banish
Wail of the worker, and curse of the crushed;
Joy break in songs from her jubilant millions,
Hailing the day when all discords are hushed.

God save America! Bearing the olive
Hers be the blessing the peacemakers prove,
Calling the nation to glad federation,
Leading the world in the triumph of love!

God save America! 'Mid all her splendors,
Save her from pride and from luxury;
Throne in her heart the unseen and eternal;
Right be her might and the truth make her free![1]

Obviously the distance between this hymn and the American gospel song is very great--and this is the distance Rauschenbusch traveled. At the end of his essay on hymnology Rauschenbusch said: "If the church has old hymns of social redemption stored away, let us have them. But social redemption wants hymns."[2]

In any case, the career as a pietist hymnologist in New York was the last formally pietistic responsibility which he discharged. If the Zweite Deutsche Baptisten Gemeinde in New York was a Collegia pietatis surrounded by walls, these walls were crumbling. The basic thrust of pietism is to offer spiritual re-birth through the Cross of Christ and then to gather these converts into cells or churches. A limited amount of welfare work will be done for the victims of social tragedy.

---

[1] The Rochester Theological Seminary Bulletin, LXIX, No. 3, 19.

[2] Rauschenbusch, The Rochester Theological Seminary Bulletin, op. cit., p. 12.

The chronological survey revealed that in addition to pietism, Rauschenbusch brought smaller portions of sectarianism and liberalism to the New York pastorate. Although his initial orientation in the Second German Baptist church was essentially pietist it was not solely pietist.

In seeking the origins of his ethics in New York, one observes: first of all the negative breakdown of an individualistic approach, then a prophetic, sectarian feeling of righteous indignation against the suffering which seemed to be imposed on people, and then the encounter with liberalism in social and political movements and in the literature of protest. Interposed in between all this is a trip to Europe for more insight into social questions and the discovery of Baptist colleagues who were not pietists.

Let us note some of the details of these developments in New York.

The New York pastorate, 1886-1897

The Introduction to Rauschenbusch's first great book contains this moving paragraph:

> I have written this book to discharge a debt. For eleven years I was pastor among the working people on the West Side of New York City. I shared their life as well as I then knew, and used up the early strength of my life in their service. In recent years my work has been turned into other channels, but I have never ceased to feel that I owe help to the plain people who were my friends. If this book in some far-off way helps to ease the pressure that bears them down and increases the forces that bear them up, I shall meet the Master of my life with better confidence.[1]

Obviously, Rauschenbusch's career in the literary aspects of the social gospel is seen as fulfilling a solemn covenant made in his New York pastorate. Chapter V of the aforementioned volume is called, "The Present Crisis," and, in effect, is a systematic commentary on his New York experience. There are dozens of comments coming directly out the shocking experiences of a sensitive young pastor in his twenties in the New York of nearly seventy years ago. Here are some typical outbursts of moral indignation:

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. xv.

> Children are begotten in a state of physical exhaustion. Underfed and overworked women in tenement and factory are nourishing the children in their prenatal life. During the years when a workingman's family is bringing up young children, before their earnings become available, the family is submerged in poverty through these parental burdens, and neither the parents nor the growing children are likely to be well fed and well housed. Very early in life the children are hitched to the machine for life and the vitality which ought to build their bodies during the crucial period of adolescence is used up to make goods a little cheaper, or, what is more likely, merely to make profits a little larger.[1]

Then Rauschenbusch makes a comparison between the way human beings were being nurtured and the lower animals and trees:

> Imagine that any breeder of stock should breed horses or sows under such conditions, what would be the result in a few generations? Our apple orchards are planted in wide squares, so that every tree has the soil, the air, the sunshine, which it needs. If we planted a dense jungle of trees, we should have a dwarfed growth, scraggy and thorny, and only here and there a crabbed apple. What harvest of human kind will we have in the broad field of our republic if we plant men in that way?[2]

In addition he cites cases of a very concrete character. An elderly man is killed by a street car. Damages of one-hundred dollars are paid, and that reluctantly. Rauschenbusch encounters the death and funerals of many small children, the ghastly sanitary facilities, the exploitation of clerks in department stores, the suppression of news about liberal and radical political parties, the tainting of food, gambling for little men, gambling on the stock market for big men, dishonest labels on consumers' goods, vicious competition, postponed marriages and prostitution, lack of home ownership, exploitation of women in commerce and factory, dirt, ugliness, injustice, disorganization, class, caste, decay and poison. Such was the New York City encountered by a young pastor who had been sensitized by profound Christian nurture, a great family background and brilliant cultural training in Europe and America.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 242. [2] Rauschenbusch, ibid., 242-43.

In his very first paper on social issues, Rauschenbusch wrote:

> Dear Friends, there is a social question. No one can doubt it in whose ears are ringing the wails of the mangled and crushed, who are borne along on the pent-up torrent of human life. Woe to the man who stands afar and says: Peace, peace, when there is no peace. The Jews were blinded by existing customs and the traditions of the fathers, and they rejected Christ. Let us take heed lest we too bow to that which is and refuse allegiance to that which ought to be.[1]

This was written in 1887, one year after coming to New York. Rauschenbusch is aware that the crisis which he found in New York may be cast off as peculiar to this one vast, teeming metropolitan area. To this he replies:

> No, thank God, not yet. But all the country is getting to be New York. Conditions in a great city are not abnormal, governed by different laws of development than the rest of the country. New York is only the most striking manifestation of laws operative everywhere; it is the vortex of the whirl-pool, but every drop of water in the circling mass is swung by the same forces that crowd resistless at the center. The question is not, where we are, but where are we going?[2]

Apart from the immediate context which brought about the collapse of Rauschenbusch's pietism, there are inherent weaknesses in pietism which no doubt contributed to its downfall. James Hasting Nichols points out its weakness in maintaining the character of the church as an effective historical community; in reaching for the gnat of personal morality and swallow- the camel of social and political reaction; and, in being anti-cultural, thus "cutting off its head."[3]

Also, there is a strange affinity between Pietism and the Enlightenment. In his essay in Schaff-Herzog Mirbt points out that some see the Enlightenment and Pietism as antithetical and others view the Enlightenment as the product of Pietism. "In reality," says Mirbt, "the relation between these two trends was neither one of mere antithesis nor yet one of cause and effect."[1] He goes on to show that there were points of deviation regarding revelation, piety and the Bible; and points of agreement on opposition to Lutheran orthodoxy, religious rights of individuals and practical Christianity. The common goal was the destruction of clericalism.

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, Henry George, pp. 30-31. I am deeply indebted to D. R. Sharpe for loaning this rare, hand-written manuscript from his collection of Rauschenbuschiana.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

[3] James Hastings Nichols and Sidney Mead, "Puritanism, Precisianism-Pietism-Moravianism-Quietism-Jansenism," The History of Christianity Since 1650 (Mimeographed Lectures for Church History 303, 1953), p. 5.

"At the same time," warns Mirbt, "the sincerest Pietism indirectly aided the rapid growth of the Enlightenment in Germany, not only for its contempt of culture, by giving the younger generation no adequate training to cope with the Enlightenment, but also, through its neglect of such education, by depriving those of scholarly inclinations into the rationalistic camp."[2]

The anti-cultural pietism is thus vulnerable to attack. But Walter and August Rauschenbusch were not anti-cultural in any sense. Both were superbly educated with typical European thoroughness in languages, travel, fine arts, history and literature. The answer for Walter Rauschenbusch is the rejection of confessionalism in favor of religious experience and then this experience-centeredness is spelled out in pragmatic terms. Once confessionalism is rejected the field is wide open to various liberal theologies. The American Zeitgeist, particularly in New York, permitted this to include a liberal social ethics as well as theology. But pietism started the chain reaction for Walter Rauschenbusch.

The affinity between pietism and liberalism is no less than that of pietism and sectarianism. Robert Friedmann's Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries is actually a study of the relation between pietism and sectarianism.[3]

---

[1] Paul Grunberg and Carl Mirbt, op. cit., p. 67.

[2] Paul Grunberg and Carl Mirbt, ibid., p. 67.

[3] Robert Friedmann, Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries (Goshen: The Mennonite Historical Society, 1949), See the twelve chapters in Study I, "Anabaptism and Pietism," pp. 3-85.

He quotes nine different authorities from Ritschl to Müller who believe that pietism springs out of the Anabaptist-sectarian milieu.

Friedmann rejects these theories of pietistic historical origins in terms of Anabaptist sectarianism. Nevertheless, he sadly concludes that sectarianism is constantly plagued by pietism which leads to an illicit union, causing sectarian discipleship and koinonia to be dissolved into individualistic subjectivism.

Against this background it is easy to see how August and the Walter Rauschenbusch operated in both pietistic and sectarian contexts. Particularly is this true of Baptist pietism which led ex-Lutheran August Rauschenbusch to most vigorous scholarly pursuit of these sectarian backgrounds.

The origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics were thus partially derived from pietism as mediated through his father and the German Zeitgeist as follows:

1. Pietism opened the way for Walter Rauschenbusch to receive many liberal influences. The rejection of confessional dogmatism led to an experiential, liberal and pragmatic approach to Christianity and culture. The heritage of hostility to the world is translated into a corporate theological and sociological analysis of evil social institutions. A background of critical thinking about conventional church life led to a searching critique of the empirical church, partly liberal, partly sectarian and partly transformationist.

2. Pietism in the Baptist context sent his father on the quest of a more adequate grasp of the Protestant left-wing which provided numerous insights for his social ethics.

3. The pietist adiaphra on liquor and purity of personal life were retained. The pietist individualism was radically rejected.

A perfect example of the post-pietist Rauschenbusch yet with something of the pietistic warmth is his letter to a former student, now in the ministry, on how to deal with socialism:

> I am glad that you continue to think about socialism. It is worth some of the most serious thinking. More and more I feel that the next word of the future lies within it. It will not be the final word in God's history but now it is a duty which lies before mankind and its moral leaders.
>
> Your plan to inform slowly is the best. Single ardent sermons don't help much--especially with slow thinking people. Always a little bit here and there, especially in talks. Don't throw the wisdom to the people from up above. But sit with them together and think. To put a question mark in the heads of young people is a lasting work. Not every ganglion can be a brain but it guides the reach of his muscles and distributes the emphasis.
>
> Socialism can save you from the sneaking clerical sickness of most preachers: (1) that one grows beyond the people, belonging to a caste; and sees people as if they were there for us and the church's sake instead of vice versa.[1]

In another letter to the same man, he said:

> The newspaper clipping interested me very much because it showed how the mood of the people develops further from populism to socialism. It is the same as the single tax movement under Henry George. Those who started with the Single Tax ended up with socialism.
>
> Do not preach one sidedly and never forget the religious wants of the human soul. . .[2]

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, personal letter to Max Leuschner on December 23, 1903, from Martin L. Leuschner's collection of Rauschenbusch materials at the North American Baptist Headquarters, Forest Park, Ill.

[2] *Ibid.*, April 10, 1903.

CHAPTER III

THE INFLUENCE OF SECTARIANISM

In this chapter there are two parts in the total effort to discover how the sectarian motif moulded and shaped the ethics of Rauschenbusch. The first part documents in great detail the two-generation experience of August and Walter Rauschenbusch in the literature and outlook of sixteenth-century sectarian thought. There are a number of quotations from lectures, essays and addresses to show how frequently he utilized this motif. The evidence is plentiful to show that sectarianism is one of the major influences which shaped the thinking of both father and son, August and Walter Rauschenbusch. The second part is the longer of the two. It reveals how the Kingdom ethics of Rauschenbusch originates in a very free and original appropriation of sectarian motifs. For one thing he did not have a compact typology of sectarian parties. He borrowed his sociology from the aggressive sects and his love ethic from the non-aggressive ones. In general he uses the term Anabaptist without modification or qualification. At times he lumps the Puritans together with the Anabaptists as belonging to the same general family of Christians. Rauschenbusch's originality is nowhere more strikingly illustrated than in his use of the sectarian motifs. He accepts the imitation of Christ, discipleship and Jesus literalism. He makes love primary although at times synomymous with justice. He places the Kingdom in history as the sectarians do and he stresses the analogous effect of the church on cultural institutions. On the other hand, he rejects any tendency to withdrawal while emphasizing transformation and Christianization of culture. He exchanges the sectarian emphasis on redemption for the teleology of the Kingdom. He sets aside their tragic view of history but accepts a kind of periodization in which the present is an unusually pregnant moment of insight and of social concern. He rejects the Fall but affirms original sin. Generally, he casts his ethics in the form and mould of sectarianism with much of the content from the new liberalism. Clearly, however, this stream of influence is formative in many ways as we shall show.

Consider then, the development of sectarians in Rauschenbusch. Once again the family background is basic in shaping his thinking. In 1868, when Walter was seven years old, his father went to Europe to do research for a book on Anabaptist origins. From the earliest days his father makes Walter aware of sectarianism. It is clearly false to assume that Walter Rauschenbusch utilized the left-wing motif only to please and placate his Baptist contemporaries. This interest was a legacy from his father which he continued in a scholarly manner.

With regard to _Zeitgeist_ the sectarian development is definitely not drawn from the spirit of the times. Indeed, the pursuit of reliable materials by August Rauschenbusch took place against the grain of scholarship and of popular religion. The left-wing was commonly ignored or caricatured as _Schwärmer_.[1] In many ways August Rauschenbusch ranks as one of the genuine pioneers of left-wing research in America. Walter Rauschenbusch's essay on Conrad Grebel years later, namely 1905, even places him in the category of pioneer because so little was available in English fifty years ago. Therefore, _Zeitgeist_ provides no explanation of sectarian motifs.

Rauschenbusch's own self-image or ideology is replete with sectarian consciousness climaxed and structured in a Kingdom of God ethics. Anabaptist prophetism suggested to him the revolutionary impact of the Kingdom of God in attacking both church and society. The twentieth-century meaning of this attack was a bold critique of Mammonistic industrialism. Thus, the sectarian consciousness flows into his ethics at an early stage and provides a basic clue as it interacts with liberalism and transformationism.

---

[1] _Schwärmer_ is a term of reproach meaning enthusiastic rabble.

As for the use of books, his father, August, bequeathed him some of the key primary sectarian sources available in the German language. He places special emphasis on the writings of an English Baptist, Richard Heath, who was a serious Anabaptist scholar of his time as well as a bold pamphleteer against the tragic movement of the working classes away from the church. Other relevant books permit us to see how these entered into his thinking.

The demonstration of origins in sectarianism, then, is divided into two parts: the general survey of Anabaptist-sectarian materials as known to Walter Rauschenbusch and his highly original appropriation of these materials in building his master truth of the Kingdom of God--the key to both theology and ethics.

Part One: Rauschenbusch Encounters Sectarian Literature and History

Studies in the left-wing of the Reformation have reached an all-time peak in both quality and quantity. The Continent has been studied by German, Swiss, English and American scholars. The Anglo-Saxon left-wing has received even wider attention here because of linguistic and cultural ties to Great Britain.

Walter Rauschenbusch's closest relationship was to the Continent but the evidence also shows that he related himself to the English non-conformists as well. Actually, his spiritual and scholarly understanding of the Continental left-wing is a legacy from his father. The information in Leben und Wirke von August Rauschenbusch reveals that his father had a deep interest and sound knowledge of the Anabaptists as the radicals of the sixteenth-century Reformation.[1] The most revealing aspect of his concerns here a trip to Germany, 1868-69, in order to gather material for a history of Anabaptist movement. He visited Waldshut, a town in Lower Austria, where Balthasar Hübmaier had preached and where the Peasants revolt had broken out. At this time he went to key universities such as Freiburg, Zürich and Basel, seeking the remains of Waldensian and Anabaptist literature. With the true scholarly concern for primary sources, he made copies of many original documents and other rare publications. August Rauschenbusch also sought out the scholars who could help him the most in understanding the left-wing of the Reformation. Among the scholars were a Catholic priest in Waldshut, three Catholic professors at Ulm, Dr. Schreiber of Freiburg and Professor C. A. Cornelius of Munich, the leading Anabaptist scholar of his day. Professor Cornelius published a source book on the Anabaptists in Leipzig 1855-60 under the title, *Geschichte des münsterischen Aufruhr in drei Buchern*. This book was read by both August and Walter Rauschenbusch and no one could have started with a sounder tutor than the Roman Catholic professor from Münich, C. A. Cornelius, whose books are still listed on basic bibliographies in this area of interest.[2]

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, *Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch* (Kassel: J. G. Oncken, 1901), p. 221. See also a similarly revealing article on August Rauschenbusch by Christian Hege and Christian Neff, *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, Frankfort am Main und Weierhof. Pfalz, 1913ff, III, 430-432; by Dr. Ernst Crous of Berlin and Gottingen. An English edition of the *Lexikon* is now being published in the U. S. A.

[2] A thorough investigation at Freiburg, Zurich and Basel along with Professor Cornelius and at the key libraries of Switzerland very likely would have disclosed the additional works available in 1869: Sebastian Franck, *Chronica*, Zeitbuch und Geschichtsbibel (Strasburg, 1531); H. Bullinger, *Von dem unverschampten fräfel...der selbstgesandten Widertöufferen* (Zurich, 1531), and *Der Wider töufferen Ursprung* (Zurich, 1561); J. H. Ottius, *Annales Anabaptistica* (Basel, 1672); Gottfried Arnold, *Unparterische Kirchen u. Ketzerhistorien* (Frankfort, 1699, 1729), *Schaffhausen*, 1744-45; Max Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der Rh.-W.-Ev. Kirche*, 3 v. (Coblenz, 1849-60); Menno Simons, *Fundamentboek* (Amsterdam, 1539); Thieleman J. van Braght, *Bloedig Tooneel of Martelaars-Spiegel* (1631, 1660, 1685).

Unfortunately, this splendid orientation in left-wing research and materials never culminated in the book which he hoped to write and which the American scene needed very badly.[1] He did write three articles for the German encyclopedia edited by Professor Schem in New York. These articles were on the Baptists, Mennonites and "Dunkers" now known as the Church of the Brethren. In 1851 he made a trip to Canada where he met the Mennonites of Ontario. Their stress on moral conduct, as well as their church life made a deep impression on him. But their non-missionary outlook and their failure to demand conversion sent him on to other groups eventually leading him to the Baptists. His contacts with the Mennonites later became the occasion for long scholarly articles about him in the Mennonitisches Lexikon.

In general, the basic conception of August Rauschenbusch stressed the continuity of the sectarian-pietist motif from modern times back to the apostolic era via the Anabaptists. He believed that true Christian congregations always existed even when in secret. In writing his father's biography, Walter Rauschenbusch suggests that the Baptists over-stressed external continuity. He made a counter proposal that "Ubi Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia" (where the Holy Spirit is, there is the church) would convey the true norm.

Harold S. Bender, one of the leading Anabaptist scholars of America, believes that August Rauschenbusch knew the best scholars and soundest materials on Continental left-wing groups available at the time of his career at Rochester Baptist Seminary, namely, 1858-1890.[2] During those years the left-wing was either ignored or caricatured. August Rauschenbusch neither ignored nor caricatured the Anabaptists. Out of this background was to come one of the most formative influences in the development of Walter Rauschenbusch's social gospel.

---

[1] The materials in English concerning the left-wing groups on the Continent were very small when August Rauschenbusch went abroad in 1869 to collect materials for his book. Guido de Bray's, The Rise, Spring and Foundation of the Anabaptists (Cambridge, 1618) and J. Newton Brown's, The Life and Times of Menno (Philadelphia, 1853) were about the only books available. Walter Rauschenbusch's English Baptist friend, Richard Heath, published his Anabaptism From the Rise at Zwickau to its Fall at Munster 1521-1536 in 1895; it was the first modern work after de Bray! Of course, the Anglo-Saxon left-wing is another matter.

[2] Personal conversation with the writer, July 7, 1954, Goshen, Indiana.

The foregoing analysis is not to make August Rauschenbusch a sectarian of the sectarians. In the presidential address of Carl E. Schneider to the American Society of Church History, December 30, 1954, August Rauschenbusch is described as having four phases: Rationalist, Pietist, Pietist-Puritan and Baptist.[1] Of these the influence of pietism, broadly conceived in the German context, is the major one. Professor Schneider's analysis is underdeveloped in relation to the Anabaptist materials but, on the whole, provides a profound setting for the background of Walter Rauschenbusch.

As for Walter Rauschenbusch himself, the evidence is also clear that he was explicitly related to the mainstream of Anabaptist scholarship. A vivid example of this is his translation and commentary on Conrad Grebel's letter to Thomas Muenzer.

Note the following aspects of Walter Rauschenbusch's scholarly labors in translating this letter:

1. It is a translation of a letter published originally in Professor Cornelius's Geschichte des Muensterischen Aufruhrs, the book discovered by his father in 1868.[2] Here is proof of the way in which his father's scholarly con-

---

[1] Carl E. Schneider, "Americanization of Karl August Rauschenbusch, 1816-1899," Church History, XXIV, No. 1 (March, 1955), 3-14. Professor Schneider is one of the leading authorities on the religio-cultural aspects of the German migration to the United States. See his, The German Church on the American Frontier (St. Louis: Eden Publishing Co., 1939); and the Yale doctoral thesis which utilized the rich materials in the Eden library: David Georg Gelzer, Mission to America Being a History of the Work of the Basel Foreign Missions Society in America (Unpublished disseration for Doctor of Philosophy, Yale University, 1952). See pages 290 and 296 for references to Walter Rauschenbusch.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Zurich Anabaptists and Thomas Muenzer," The American Journal of Theology, IX (January, 1905), 91.

cerns were utilized by the son. The opening paragraph is an interesting commentary on bi-lingual, left-wing-minded Rauschenbusch:

> The letter of Conrad Grebel and his friends at Zurich to Thomas Muenzer of which a translation is here presented was published by Professor C. A. Cornelius in his Geschichte des Muensterischen Aufruhrs, Book II, (Appendix I), 1860. It is often referred to as one of the most important sources of information about the Swiss Anabaptists in their earlier stage, but, so far as I have seen, no really adequate use has been made of it. For English and American students of Anabaptist history its use is hedged about with several difficulties. The book of Cornelius is becoming rare. The German text not only presents the usual difficulties of literal reprints from the first quarter of the sixteenth century, but it is filled with Swiss idioms, so that even those who read German fluently might find it hard to get more than general thought.[1]

Thus, in order to make this rare document available for English and American students of Anabaptist life, Rauschenbusch undertakes the translation and commentary.

2. It is significant that fifty years after its publication, this material appears in most standard bibliographies on the Reformation radicals. It is the first quotation in Franklin H. Littell's chapter on "The Quest for the Essence of Anabaptism," in his, The Anabaptist View of the Church.[2] It is used at Yale and Chicago where concern for the left-wing is prominent. Thus, Walter Rauschenbusch not only pioneered with Anabaptist materials but displayed sound scholarship which has survived a half century.

3. Finally, it is significant that he published this paper in The American Journal of Theology in 1905 which was published by the University of Chicago from 1897-1920 for historical and theology materials. It suggests his close relationship with another essentially Baptist faculty.

Walter Rauschenbusch did not limit his Anabaptist investigations to this one article. At the funeral service in Rochester July 27, 1918, Professor Henry B. Robins, a colleague of Rauschenbusch, referred to his basic approach to church history:

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, ibid., p. 91.

[2] (Philadelphia: American Society of Church History, 1952), p. 19.

> Professor Rauschenbusch did not attempt to cover the whole broad chronological stretch of Church History, but, especially in those early years focused upon two great creative epochs--the period down to and including Nicea and the period of the Reformation.
>
> . . . As one listened, he could see men emerging from that past--real people, both individuals and groups; he could realize somewhat the world which conditioned these folks, the ideal which controlled them, the passions which made them great or covered them with shame; and somehow that dead past came alive, human, full of intensest interest.[1]

Then in a passage which deals specifically with both the early church and the Anabaptists, Professor Robins notes:

> How could one follow his account of the new and greater manifestation of love in the Christian Agapai, or in those fraternal Christian groups among the first European churches, which did so much more to the spirits of men than ever the Great sodalities could have done--how could one follow him here and not be impressed also with the deeply Christian spirit that enabled him to discern all this behind the conventional narratives and in spite of fragmentariness of the records. *Nor could one work with him through Anabaptist history without feeling that the actual course of the social movement which conditioned the religious upheaval known as the Reformation has never been adequately traced and probably never can be because the peasant and commoner were held of so little account; without feeling much more, the passionate interest in the lives of plain people which gave our beloved scholar so great a measure of interpretive insight*. (Italics mine)[2]

In another significant passage Professor Robins observes:

> . . .It was borne in upon us that life is all of a piece, and we saw how close together lie the interests of the state, and the church and the common man, and how impossible is the rebirth of religion in a wholly conventionalized world, or the entrance of an individual or class into their full Christian birthright apart from a complete realignment of life.[3]

This, then, is a survey of Rauschenbusch as a teacher of church history by a former student and a colleague on the faculty. He affirmed the normative character and then the fall the early church along with the Anabaptists as the key to the Reformation. Both the early church and the Anabaptists were seen against the background of church history as a dynamic aspect of the total situation where state, church and society interact on one another, demanding a total change or else a futile irrelevence.

---

[1] *Rochester Theological Seminary Bulletin*, LXIX, No. 3, 33.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

Let us hear from Rauschenbusch himself on the basic role of the Reformation sectarians. This was his sermon "The Freedom of Spiritual Religion" preached before the Northern Baptist Convention in Chicago, May 8, 1910. It is very revealing of his total view of the Reformation:

> . . . The organization of our denomination began in the last grand transitional age, in the Protestant Reformation. In that transition were far to the front, on the skirmish line. We were the radicals of radicals. Of the three great reformers--Luther, Calvin and Zwingli--Zwingli was the most radical, so that Luther and Melanchthon were anxious to disavow the Anabaptists. The first great creed of the Lutheran Church, 'The Augsburg Confession' point by point makes it clear that the Lutheran party would have nothing to do with the Anabaptists. The epoch-making theology of Calvinism, Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion was first written to prove to the King of France that the Protestants were good people and had nothing to do with such extremists as the Anabaptists. When the Baptist movement was in its cradle, nobody expected that baby to sit on the brakes of the chariot of progress.[1]

If there was any doubt about the radical perspective from which Rauschenbusch views church history, it is clarified in the following passage from the same address:

> We were for a 'reformation without tarrying', even if we had to leave the old church and break it in pieces. We were against clericalism and against all hierarchies. We were for the religious emancipation of the laity. We went as far as the most radical Calvinist in purging religion of superstition, and when he stopped we went on. The others reformed the Lord's Supper, and cleared it of the abuses which had grown up about it, but they feared to attempt the reformation of baptism, for they knew that would shake the foundation of church life. The abolition of infant baptism meant not simply the modification of one church rite, but a revolutionary reconstruction of the very conception of the church.
>
> That is the kind of movement which our fathers initiated. They paid for their understanding with their blood, but the God of history has indicated their daring. In the long, slow sweep of four centuries, often by devious and pathetic ways, the course of religious development for the Protestant would has been in the direction marked out by the swift rush of radical parties of the Reformation. (Italics mine) That course has been fastest and most decided where Christianity has been allowed to follow its own genius with least hindrances from the conservatism of the past. Its triumph has been most complete in our own country. . .[2]

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, The Freedom of Spiritual Religion (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1910), p. 12.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Surely there could be no more consistent and thoroughgoing reading of modern ecclesiastical and cultural history than this Anabaptist-centered conception of Rauschenbusch. His conclusion that the Reformation radicals were determinative in sharing American life is similar to the conclusion of Ernst Troeltsch that democratic institutions as a whole stem from this free church background.

Up to this point, the stress has been on the Continental radicals, and properly so, since Rauschenbusch's roots and studies are concentrated there.[1] On the other hand, he identified himself with the English left-wing as well. For example, his address at Boston, November 30, 1908, shows his grasp of the Anglo-Saxon background: (the quotation is from a newspaper report in Springfield, Massachusetts, *Daily Republican*):

> Professor Rauschenbusch spoke on the 'The revolutionary ancestry of the Congregationalists and Baptists.' He undertook to show that they originated together in a revolutionary age. They were the exponents of that revolution and its prime movers, both in religion and politics. Apparently, they were defeated at the time, but in fact they were successful and their great aims have helped to create the modern world. The revolutionary spirit is embodied in their constitution and traditions. This constitutes both a call and a qualification to do their full duty in the social revolution which is now upon us.
>
> The speaker made it plain that he meant by 'revolution' not a transitory violent outbreak, but a large historical change in fundamental convictions and institutions of a nation or an age. It might last a century or two. He then sketched the progress of the Puritan movement in England at the beginning of the seventeenth century and the rise of the independents. They proposed to create churches of believers who united freely on a basis of equality in little church democracies, repudiating both the help and the interference of the state. This ideal of the church was revolutionary at that time, and ran far beyond the ideas realized by the Reformation on the Continent. These early Congregationalists and Baptists at first lived in exile in Holland. Some of them came to America, (e.g.) the Pilgrims of the Mayflower. The Puritans who followed them did not at first hold this ideal but in the free life of the virgin continent they tended that way by a sort of spiritual gravitation, and Congregationalism found its first large development in America. The men and ideas bred by it here went across the sea and were a powerful

---

[1] For references to the Anabaptists in his books see: *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, pp. 331, 401, 402; *Christianizing the Social Order*, p. 83; *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, pp. 195, 205.

influence in promoting radical thought in England.[1]

Once again one detects a sense of the creativity of radical Protestantism and free institutions--in this case via the Puritans. Rauschenbusch is actually less aware of this stream of thought because it was English rather than Continental. Nevertheless, it is obvious that he was aware of it as his lecture in Boston clearly indicates. Indeed, he was aware that in Germany the Anabaptists were crushed with tragic effects.[2] On the other hand, English Puritanism was vital and dynamic in its effect on society. His words are these:

> Religious life insofar as it affects political life in England is the humanitarian democracy begotten by Puritanism. German religion has been taught to confine itself to the inner life, the family and the personal calling. When religion effects political action in Germany it is by ecclesiastical considerations rather than by ethical spirit."[3]

As far as the Baptist church in America and England is concerned, the roots are clearly in English Puritanism. As Moehlman points out the Philadelphia Confession of 1742 is closely related to the Westminster Confession of 1646. The London Confession of 1677 is largely a reproduction of Westminster, suggesting to Moehlman that the Baptists look more to Calvin's Geneva than Hub-Maier's Zurich. Professor Hudson of Colgate-Rochester feels very strongly about this latter point and has written an essay completely and totally repudiating any Anabaptist background for the Baptists, blaming Thomas Crosby's History of English Baptists 1738-40 for launching the Anabaptist-Baptist connection which Rauschenbusch accepted and which most Baptists still accept.[4] Apparently, Professor Hudson remains in a minority in his view against formidable opposition. Ernst Troeltsch in his Protestantism and Progress (Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus fur die Entstehung der Modersen Welt) argues that the Cromwellian Independency generated the ideas of the separation of church and state, the toleration of various churches along side each other, the principle of voluntarism in the establishment of denominations, freedom in both religion and culture. All this, Troeltsch continues, is the end of the old medieval culture concept and the beginning of modern individual, non-ecclesiastical culture. The fact that the Continental expressions of this were secular and rationalistic must not obscure the fact that in England its religious roots were in the Puritan revolution. The crucial point then is made that:

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Revolutionary Ancestry of the Congregationalists and Baptists," The Springfield Daily Republican, Dec. 1, 1908. The photostatic copy of this report was supplied through the courtesy of the City Library Association, Springfield, Mass.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology," American Journal of Theology, XI, No. 1,(Jan. 1907), 125.

[3] The Watchman, 1899, quoted by Conrad H. Moehlman, op. cit., p. 41.

[4] Winthrop Hudson, "Baptists are Not Anabaptists," The Chronicle Journal of the American Baptist Historical Society, XVI, No. 4 (Oct. 1953), 171-178. See also his essay, "Who were the Baptists?," The Baptist Quarterly, incorporating the transaction of the British Bapt. Historical Society, XVI, No. 7 (July, 1956), 303-312.

> . . . This is not properly speaking the work of Protestantism but of the revived Ana Baptist and Spiritualist movements in combination with Calvinism of a radical tendency.[1]
>
> It was now at last the turn of the step-children of the Reformation to have their great hour in the history of the world.[2]

Ernest A. Payne, leading English Baptist historians who is vice-chairman of the World Council of Churches Central Committee, believes that the English Puritan Left-wing drew a great deal of its inspiration from the Swiss, German and Dutch Anabaptists.[3]

Likewise Rufus Jones in his Studies in Mystical Religion wrote that the Continental Anabaptists provide "the soil out of which all nonconformists sects have sprung, and it is the first plain announcement in modern history of a program for a new type of Christian society in the modern world, especially in America and England. . . an absolutely free and independent religious society, and a state in which every man counts as a man, and has his share in shaping both church and state."[1]

---

[1] Ernst Troeltsch, Protestantism and Progress (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912), p. 126.

[2] Ibid., p. 124.

[3] Ernst A. Payne, The Anabaptists of the 16th Century (London: 1949), pp. 5ff. See also Harold S. Bender's The Anabaptists and Religious Liberty, (Sonderdruck, Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte).

The most recent Baptist history is that of Robert G. Torbet of the American Baptist Board of Education and Publication. Kenneth Scott Latourette writes the foreword, saying that "nowhere else is there to be found in so nearly inclusive and up-to-date fashion a summary of the people who bear the name Baptist."[2] Torbet concludes that "with respect to the relationship between Anabaptists and Baptists, it is safe to say that the latter are the spiritual descendents of _some_ of the former."[3]

In summary, it appears that the position of Walter Rauschenbusch still has very serious support in scholarly opinion despite the rejection of Professor Hudson. In any case, his kinship with both the Continental and Anglo-Saxon left-wing Protestants is very real and his discovery of their relationship to social and political activity very important.

A more valid criticism of Rauschenbusch in the light of recent historiography is his failure to have typology for the different kinds of Anabaptists.

Newman's A Manual of Church History, for example, has a very suggestive and, in many ways, still sound typology for Anabaptists:

1. Chiliastic: Melchiorites and Muensterites
2. Soundly Biblical: Swiss Brethren and followers in South Germany, Moravian Hutterites, and Mennonites
3. Pantheistic: David Joris
4. Mystical: Hans Denck and Ludwig Hetzer
5. Antitrinitarian: Socianianism[4]

---

[1] Rufus Jones, _Studies in Mystical Religion_ (London: Macmillan & Co., 1923), p. 369.

[2] Quoted in Robert G. Torbet, _A History of the Baptists_ (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1950), p. 7.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 54. See also Hoop Scheffer and Jacob de Gijsbert's _History of the Free Churchmen Called Brownists, Pilgrim Fathers, and Baptists in the Dutch Republic 1578-1701_. (Ithaca: Andrus and Church, 1922) for important evidence on the relationship between Baptists and Anabaptists. The most recent research into this problem is now being carried on by Irvin Horst in connection with a doctoral dissertation at the University of Amsterdam.

[4] A. H. Newman, _A Manual of Church History_ (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1908), pp. 156-201.

Bainton's famour article in the Journal of Religion defines the left-wing as follows:

> The left-wing is composed of those who separated church and state and rejected the civil arm in matters of religion. These groups are commonly to the left also with regard to church organization, sacraments and creeds.[1]

In addition, Bainton would stress the left-wing as emphasizing ethical reality, restitution of the apostolic church in place of a fallen church, and the eschatology which was revived by Joachim of Flora in the twelfth century.

A second criticism of Rauschenbusch is his failure to utilize Troeltsch with adequate sharpness. In defense of Rauschenbusch, it should be pointed out that Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen was published in 1911, hence, it is not really available for Christianity and the Social Crisis (1907), or Christianizing the Social Order (1913). However, in his last great book, A Theology for the Social Gospel (1917) Rauschenbusch definitely mentions Troeltsch:

> The monumental work of Troeltsch, 'die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen and Gruppen' is the first and chief attempt to apply methods of the history of doctrine to the social convictions and hopes of the churches.[2]

To be sure many dimensions of the sectarian view of the church occur in Rauschenbusch as we shall show in this chapter. But the full use of Troeltsch would have sharpened his own formulation. What is more, he might well have adopted Troeltsch's creative concept of "ascetic Protestantism" which represents a fusion of Calvinism, Spiritualism and the sects in a neo-Calvinism. It is what James Hastings Nichols prefers to call Puritan Protestantism.[3]

---

[1] "The Left-Wing of the Reformation," Journal of Religion, XXL, No. 2 (April, 1941), 125.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), p. 28.

[3] James Hastings Nichols, Democracy and the Churches (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951), p. 10.

This is not to say that the Troeltschian typology is perfect. As Robert Kreider points out:

> First, the two terms 'church' and 'sect,' which are theoretical types, seldom characterize with precision actual religious bodies, which are invariably a blending of the two types. Second, the definition is a static structural one and fails to account for the genesis and continuing dynamic of religious bodies. Third, this distinction is on a sociological level. . . . The neglect of the spiritual and participationist dimension has left the studies of some sociologists of religious ultimately unconvincing.[1]

Nevertheless, Kreider still accepts the usefulness of the basic Troeltschian insights and typology. For Rauschenbusch, too, it would have added more clarity.

Finally, a deeper look into origins would have helped Rauschenbusch to go beyond the sociological perspective whereby he saw the left-wing of the Reformation as a movement of socio-religious emancipation for oppressed peasants and other disenfranchised groups, the view which Balfort Bax popularized in his Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists (New York, 1903) and also affirmed in H. Richard Niebuhr's Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York, 1929).

In addition to the Bax-Niebuhr-Rauschenbusch view the present writer has suggested nine other views of origins for the Anabaptists:[2]

1. Forerunners of modern socialism and the culminating effort of medieval communism: Kautsky
2. Continuation of the Third Order of St. Francis: Ritschl
3. Link in the chain of dissenters from Apostolic church, Donatists, Paulicians, Cathari, Bogomili and Waldensians: Ludwig Keller stressing role of Waldensians; Baptist historians stressing continuity.
4. Continuity with mystics: Rufus Jones

---

[1] Robert Kreider, "The Anabaptist Conception of the Church in the Russian Mennonite Environment," The Mennonite Quarterly Review, XXV, No. 1 (Jan., 1951), 18. Kreider also suggests that we should substitute the word, "brotherhood" for the word, "sect."

[2] Donovan E. Smucker, "The Anabaptist Historiography in the Scholarship of Today," Mennonite Quarterly Review, XXII, No. 2 (April, 1948).

5. Heirs of Erasmus: Walter Koehler and Winthrop Hudson
6. Forerunners of modern civilization (divided into evangelical and aggressive wings): Troeltsch
7. Rediscovered theology of martyrdom: Ethelberg Stauffer
8. Schwärmer and heretics: Luther
9. The culmination of the Reformation, fulfilling the original vision of Luther, Zwingli: Max Gobel, C. A. Cornelius, Johann Loserth, Karl Rembert, Ernst Correll, John Horsch, Fritz Blanke, and H. S. Bender.

These criticisms of Rauschenbusch's limited typology, his inability to utilize Troeltsch and his inadequate study of origins do not mean to imply that Rauschenbusch lagged behind the scholarship of his day. In the States he possessed a knowledge of left-wing sources which was unquestionably better than that of most historians who still persisted in ignoring or caricaturing the Reformation radicals. In terms of Europe, with men like Loserth and Rembert he lagged behind somewhat because of the inherent limitations of an American location (at that time) for Continental research.

Walter Rauschenbusch represented two generations of authentic encounter with left-wing Protestant materials. This encounter was bound to manifest itself when he began to construct his basic system of thought.

Part Two: Sectarian Motifs Utilized in the Construction of a Kingdom of God Ethics

The previous section documented Walter Rauschenbusch's legacy of left-wing, sectarian research and impact. Out of this authentic encounter with sectarians, especially from Continental Europe, came one of the basic origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics. From his boyhood he was aware of his father's interest in these prophetic and revolutionary Protestant movements. Though somewhat latent in his mind in the earlier years, this sectarian background arose with great power as he sought to put together the outlines of his ethics.

The second part of Chapter III on "The Influence of Sectarianism" is now before us. Here we note how the broad influence and perspective of the sectarian background is utilized in systematically constructing the ethics of the Kingdom of God for which he was to become famous. While the origins of his ethics is, in part, unquestionably in the sectarian context, it is highly important to understand that he is not bound by any compact confessional limitation; nor is he confined by any lack of academic freedom; nor is he bound by his father's more intense pietism. In this second part it is clear that he makes the freest and most original use of his sectarian origins. Indeed, at times the sectarians would hardly recognize themselves in these formulations. Usually the forms of sectarianism are present. Sometimes the content of sectarianism is present. In all cases, the sectarian origins flow freely in and out of his basic conceptions.

In this part we shall document the formulation from his writings and, quite frequently, note his specific connection of this formulation with the left-wing background as in his speech on "The Church and the Money Power" where he describes Anabaptism as "the revolutionary kind of doctrine, brimful of social applications of Christianity."[1] In the same address he indicates that the Catholics and Lutherans represented the upper and middle classes, respectively, which crushed the lower-class sectarian movements.

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Church and Money Power," The Proceedings of the Baptist Congress, 1893, p. 51.

In addition, Richard Heath is given as a probable influence in his development based primarily on the testimony of a living eye-witness to Heath's impact on Rauschenbusch. This eye-witness is Professor C. H. Moehlman, Rauschenbusch's successor in the church history chair at Colgate-Rochester. And also the influence of Emil de Laveleye, a maverick, crypto-sectarian Catholic with strong influence on Rauschenbusch's doctrine of the analogous role of the church.

Part two is important to our basic design and argument because the sectarian origins are crucial to his uniquely free selection and appropriation of materials for the Kingdom of God ethics. Without these sectarian origins, his approach to social ethics would be a genuine puzzle.

A Descriptive Outline of Rauschenbusch's Conception of the Kingdom of God Followed by a Study of Sectarian Motifs Influencing the Development of These Conceptions

A. The Definition of the Kingdom of God:

   1. The Reign of God Coming through the Progressive Growth of Love in Society Leading to a Humanity Organized According to the Will of God.

B. The Role of the Kingdom:

   1. The Master Key to the Mind of Christ

   2. The Number One Material Principle of the New Theology

C. The Response to the Kingdom:

   1. Discipleship and Apostolate Leading to the Cross and Cultural Conflict

D. The Function of the Kingdom:

   1. Christianize the Social Order by the Abolition of Unjust Privilege While Changing Semi-Christian Social Institutions.

E. The Scope and Location of the Kingdom:

   1. A Universal socio-historical Reality Struggling with Pietistic Subjectivism, Other-worldliness and Apocalypticism, the Latter Three Seeking to Limit the Scope or Driving the Location of the Kingdom out of History

F. The Ethics of the Kingdom:

- 1. The Sanctity and Value of Life
- 2. The Solidarity of the Human Family
- 3. Love as the Law of Life, Leading the Strong to Stand With the Weak
    - a) Love is not Incompatible with Self-Interest
    - b) Love and Justice are Supplemental not Anti-thetical
    - c) Love and Justice, at times, are Synonymous

G. The Sociology of the Kingdom:

- 1. Life Operates in a Solidaristic, Socio-Organic Context
    - a) Sin Expresses itself in Super-Personal Social Institutions Binding Us Together in the Kingdom of Evil, A Common Yoke of Suffering
        - (1) Mammonism or Economic Privilege is the Key to the Social Problem
    - b) The Kingdom of God Comes to Save Us from the Super-Personal Social Forces: Kingdom versus Kingdom

H. The Ecclesiology of the Kingdom:

- 1. The True Church is a Disciplined, Democratic Voluntary Association
- 2. The True Church Rejects
    - a) Sacramentalism and Ceremonialism
    - b) Hierarchical Priesthoods
    - c) Hellenized Theologizing
    - d) Alliances with the State
- 3. The Church Has a very Direct Effect on Social Institutions
    - a) When the Church is a Democratic, Voluntary Association it Stimulates Democratic Social Institutions
    - b) When the Church is Autocratic and Other-Worldly it Stimulates Autocratic Social Institutions
- 4. The Church's Sole Reason for Being is to Serve the Kingdom: When it Does not Do So, it is Anti-Christian
- 5. Nevertheless, the Church Can Never Fully Contain the Kingdom Whose Natural Habitat is All Mankind

I. The Philosophy of History of the Kingdom:

1. The Socio-Ethical Failure of the Church is not Due to Factors Inherent in the Church or History but to Temporary Causes Now Inoperative

2. The Kingdom comes in a Gradualistic, Evolutionary Rather than Catastrophic Manner

3. History, on the other hand, Shows Distinct Periodizations of Which the Present Moment is one of the Greatest Opportunities Since the Renaissance and Reformation

A. The Definition of the Kingdom of God: The Reign of God Coming Through the Progressive Growth of Love in Society Leading to a Humanity Organized According to the Will of God

Rauschenbusch offers a number of related definitions of the Kingdom of God the best of which is the Kingdom defined as the reign of God.[1]

In the Taylor lectures at Yale he supports the view that "the Kingdom of God is humanity organized according to the will of God."[2]

In the same Taylor lectures he also declares that "since love is the supreme law of Christ, the Kingdom of God implies a progressive reign of love in human affairs."[3]

Or, there is the frequently quoted statement of his that "this doctrine [the Kingdom of God] is the social gospel."[4]

Finally, we may cite the definition where the Kingdom is equated with the ideal social order and the perfect ethic: "Jesus bade us 'seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness,' and he obeyed his own call. The main object in his life was the ideal social order and the perfect ethic."[5]

Rauschenbusch sees the Anabaptists as only a part of a larger movement the key to which is the Reign of God on earth:

---

[1] _Christianizing the Social Order_, p. 49.

[2] _A Theology for the Social Gospel_, p. 142.

[3] _Ibid_. [4] _Ibid_., p. 131.

[5] _The Social Principles of Jesus_, p. 60.

> Beginning with the twelfth century, a series of remarkable religious movements ran through the countries of Western Europe, differing widely in their local aims, and doctrinal coloring, but with a strange unanimity of spirit and purpose. Some, like the Franciscan movement, were protected and perverted by the Church; others, like that of the Waldenses, the Lollards, the Taborites and the Anabaptists, were condemned and persecuted by it. We are accustomed to speak of the latter group as evangelical sects, and to interpret them as forerunners of the Protestant Reformation. It is much closer to historical truth to say that they were the first stirrings of Christian democracy, expressions of lay religion and working-class ethics. They heralded the religious awakening of the common people and their cry for the Reign of God on earth.[1]

In this passage he goes on to show that all of these movements were under much apocalyptic excitement suggesting "a new era, a great judgment on the Church, and a golden age for all the world."[2]

The main parties of the Reformation did not build their foundations squarely on the Kingdom of God even though the radical parties did so. Nevertheless, the Reformation as a whole helped social Christianity by destroying medievalism and arousing the masses.

Another discussion of the Anabaptists reveals how the Rochester social prophet understood their contribution to the reign of God on earth:

> The Anabaptists believed in a religious transformation of social life. To understand them one must understand their times. There was a revolt of class against class, party against party everywhere. The Anabaptist movement was a religious movement with social aims. The Anabaptists entertained the social revolutionary hope under Biblical guise. Christ was to come and rescue his poor and oppressed people, and, in place of the present reign of the wicked, set-up the reign of the saints. It was a passionate hope for speedy relief from intolerable oppression.[3]

These passages make it clear that the Reign of God on earth was a conception which Rauschenbusch found not only in the Anabaptists but the forerunners of the Reformation. To this was added the progressive or evolutionary growth of love which gradually moralized the total social order, a conception more from the Enlightenment than from the left-wing groups.

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 83. [2] Ibid., p. 84.

[3] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Prophetic Character of the Anabaptist Movement," Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Sept. 15, 1903. This was the opening address for beginning of the new term of Rochester Theological Seminary. Rauschenbusch's addresses were frequently reported with the full text or very lengthy summaries. This address on the Anabaptists was given in Rockefeller Hall.

Leading scholars of the Anabaptists are agreed that the Kingdom of God is one of the major motifs of the left-wing of the Reformation--though in a somewhat different form than Rauschenbusch's adaptation of it. There is a rejection of the Kingdom as the only theme but an acceptance of it as one of the main themes in left-wing groups.

There is a rejection of the synthesis between the Kingdom and evolutionary thought with the early Anabaptists affirming the Reign of God primarily in terms of the koinonia. This Reign in the koinonia had radical implications for society as a whole but the Reign in the koinonia was not to be equated with the moral standards of society as a whole. On the other hand, since Rauschenbusch used the term Anabaptist for all the groups in this general category he could have found roots for his position in the chiliastic groups whose periodization of history had many radical social implications. Or he could have based his position on the work of a man like Balthasar Hubmaier (1440-1528) who accepted the magistracy.[1]

Robert Friedmann's article, "Recent Interpretations of Anabaptism," suggests:

> ". . . Anabaptism as an outstanding example of existential Christianity . . . Brotherly love is the most conspicuous sign of such an existential type of Christianity: where it is practiced we might also speak of its work as the Kingdom of God. It is obvious, moreover, that the Kingdom cannot exist for the 'single one' in his isolation but only for those who have united in the Koinonia, the Gemeinschaft or Gemeinde. . . . Existential Christianity and kingdom-mindedness are here suggested as new descriptive categories differentiating Anabaptism from other forms of religious realization or expression. They both support the theory that discipleship is actually the essence of Anabaptism. . . .

---

[1] Rauschenbusch's successor, C. H. Moehlman, July 25, 1955, wrote a letter to the present writer, saying: "He (WR) followed the latest German scholars in that regard (Anabaptism) and presented a very sympathetic approach to left-wing movements. He laid stress on their communism. He recommended highly the book by Vedder of Hubmaier." (H. C. Vedder, Balthasar Hubmaier, New York, 1905).

> Quite naturally, this type of kingdom-mindedness produces also a new kind of eschatological thinking. The brethren are deeply aware of the coexistence of two worlds: this world and the world of the Kingdom. They understood without much explanation 'the inbreaking miracle of eschatological order,' as Rudolph Otto calls it, that is of the Kingdom here and now. Absolute deparation from the world and non-conformity to it easily follow as corollaries.[1]

Dean Harold S. Bender discusses the same point as follows:

> The new kingdom of God which is being established in their terms and through them is of necessity distinct from the world order which is dominated by Satan. That the church and state join in persecuting the true church is only one more bit of evidence of the wickedness of the world order, they concluded. The old church (both Roman Catholic and Protestant) has failed particularly in its mixing of the two kingdoms, hence the true church must be and is being re-established separate from the world. This true church is the present kingdom of Christ which is being established in the midst of and alongside of the kingdom of this world; it is not to be deferred to some millennial future.[2]

Rauschenbusch reflects a strong Kingdom-mindedness rooted in the Continental left-wing as well as a definite sense of two Kingdoms in conflict with each other. Chapter four on "The Influences of Liberalism" will show the extent to which this sectarian motif became integrated with the Kingdom motif of the idealistic theologians and philosophers.

This Kingdom emphasis reflects in part the evangelical-Biblical-brotherhood type of Anabaptist whose literature he had read. On the other hand, Rauschenbusch rejects the limitation and restriction of the Kingdom to the koinonia in favor of the Kingdom breaking into the entire social order. Here he moves toward the aggressive sects, both Continental and English, climaxing in the neo-Calvinist or Puritan types. Chapter V will show the extent to which this universalism and catholicity came from Calvinist and Anglican sources; and Chapter IV will seek more light on this same problem from the idealistic philosophers of the Enlightenment. Chapter IV will also show how he utilized liberal Biblical hermeneutics to reinterpret the millennial teaching of early Christianity as a call to an earthly, redeemed society.

---

[1] Church History, XXIV, No. 2 (June, 1955), 144-46.

[2] Ibid., p. 128.

Thus, there are definite sectarian elements in his Kingdom definition along with Calvinist and Catholic transformationism and liberalism.

B. The Role of the Kingdom: (a) The Master Key to the Mind of Christ; (b) The Primary Material Principle of the New Theology

The Kingdom of God is the greatest truth of the mission and message of Jesus Christ. On his trip to Europe in 1891 this teaching came as a new revelation to him like the summit of some great mountain of the Alps:

> Here was the idea and purpose which had dominated the mind and purpose of the Master himself. All his teachings center about it. His life was given to it. His death was suffered for it. When a man has once seen that in the Gospels he can never unsee it again.[1]

Over and over again, he hammers away at this theme that this is the key to Jesus and, after using this key, all the doors are unlocked.

Thus if the foregoing makes the Kingdom dominant in Biblical studies and Christology, Rauschenbusch is also ready to make the idea dominant in theological formulations:

> The old theology is essentially the theology of the Reformation. The formal principle of the Reformation was the Bible; its material principle: justification by faith. That is to say, it took its guidance from the Bible and had for its object personal salvation. But back of the Bible lies the Holy Spirit which inspired it; back of the individual to be saved lies humanity of which he is a part. The formal principle of the new gospel must be the Holy Spirit; the material principle must be the Kingdom of God. Thus we shall not go back to Paul alone, who inspired the Reformation but to Jesus Christ, who founded Christianity by preaching the Kingdom of God in the power of the Spirit.[2]

The role of the Kingdom is, therefore, very great as the key to Christ and as the so-called material principles of the new theology which he was developing. What are the foundations of this emphasis? And what justification did he have for the special way in which he developed the idea?

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 93.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, The New Apostolate, quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., p. 343.

First, it is clear that he interprets the Kingdom as the all-important, primary key for the Anabaptist and other prophetic movements. For example, the first quotation in the previous section on page 100 suggested the Anabaptists as part of a larger movement starting in the twelfth century the key to which was the reign of God on earth. The second quotation on page 100 revealed Christ coming "to rescue his poor oppressed people, and in place of the present reign of the wicked set up the reign of the saints."[1]

The sectarians to which he refers possessed a rugged Kingdom-consciousness and a definite concept of the Reign of God. This, then, is an understandable dimension in the radical emphasis upon the Kingdom in his outlook. Current Anabaptist and left-wing scholarship tends to see the Kingdom as one of several basic motifs in these radical movements. For example, Orley Swartzendruber's essay on Anabaptist motifs brings out three themes:

> In the conception of the Christian life of the first Anabaptists we can see three 'moments': revelation, discipleship and the Kingdom. Revelation or illumination, the first 'moment' is the hearing and understanding of the Gospel by the direct action of the Holy Spirit. This category of Revelation dominates their language: Christ on the cross shows us God's love; He shows us the narrow way to salvation; we know the truth; we hear the call or command of Christ. But Christ calls from 'beyond,' He is coming in His Kingdom and the Kingdom a future moment is the dominant element in the revelation. This Kingdom-consciousness informs their entire message. The intermediate 'moment' between the 'knowing' and the inheriting is the narrow way of discipleship and obedience. Discipleship draws its dynamic and its assurance from the initial vision but it holds before its eyes the hope of the realization of the Kingdom.[2]

In addition to Swartzendruber's emphasis on more than one motif in Continental left-wing groups there are scholars who have singled out other motifs for primary emphasis as in the following four:

---

[1] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, op. cit.

[2] "The Piety and Theology of the Anabaptist Martyrs in van Graght's Martyrs' Mirror," Mennonite Quarterly Review, XXVIII, 140.

1. Restitution of apostolic church: Littell[1]
2. Discipleship: Bender[2]
3. Martyrdom: Stauffer[3]
4. Existential Christianity manifested in brotherly love: Friedmann[4]

Clearly the role of the Kingdom is crucial in that left-wing but it is not quite the Alpha and Omega that Rauschenbusch has made out of it.

In the second place, Rauschenbusch's emphasis on the Kingdom in this radical sense is clearly in line with the uniqueness of American Christianity as H. Richard Niebuhr pointed out in his The Kingdom of God in America. In the preface, the Yale professor lists certain discoveries concerning American Christianity which were new to him:

> The first of these was that the idea of the Kingdom of God had indeed been the dominant idea in American Christianity--just as the idea of the vision had been paramount in medieval faith--but that it had not always meant the same thing. In the early period of American life, when foundations were laid on which we have all had to build, 'kingdom of God' meant 'sovereignty of God'; in the creative period of awakening and revival it meant 'reign of Christ'; and only in the most recent period had it come to mean 'kingdom on earth.' Yet it became equally apparent that these were not simply three divergent ideas but that they were intimately related to one another, and that the idea of the kingdom of God could not be expressed in terms of one of them alone. The social gospel with its emphasis on the kingdom on earth was building on the work of previous generations with their different emphases--emphases which had implied but not expressed the ideas or the faith of subsequent movements. Kingdom on earth without sovereignty of God and reign of Christ was meaningless, as the last two were incomplete without it and without each other.[5]

In the light of Niebuhr's book it is clear that Rauschenbusch made the

---

[1] The Anabaptist View of the Church (Philadelphia: American Society of Church History, 1952).

[2] "The Anabaptist Vision," Church History, XIII, No. 1 (March, 1944), 3-24.

[3] "Taufertheologie und Martyrertum," Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte, LII, (1933), 545-598; English translation, Mennonite Quarterly Review, XIX, 179-214.

[4] "Recent Interpretations of Anabaptist," Church History, XXIV, No. 2 (June, 1955), 132-152.

[5] H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1937), pp. x-xi.

Kingdom the primary motif of his theology against the background of the American scene where the same theme, variously interpreted, was also central.

Specific evidences for this American influence in Walter Rauschenbusch's outlook will be documented most completely in Chapter IV dealing with his relation to the influences of liberalism. Here men like Henry George and Edward Bellamy mediate a socialized and moralized version of this American Kingdom consciousness.

As for the influence of Puritanism, Rauschenbusch makes reference to this in the Boston address of 1908, previously quoted as well as in other places. American pietism will be documented in the next chapter.

H. Richard Niebuhr's more friendly placement of Rauschenbusch in the context of America's Kingdom-mindedness is somewhat set aside in Christ and Culture (1951) where the Rochester social prophet is interpreted as a Ritschlian who is proposing the Christ of culture. The study of Rauschenbusch's Christology clearly reflects the new theology: The Divine nature of Jesus is based on free acts of the will rather than a passive inheritance of the Divine essence. In other words, it is based on character not nature.[1] Salvation "is the voluntary socializing of the soul"[2] as Jesus represents the "democratizing of God."[3] In this process of salvation one enters into the total life of mankind through Jesus who was perfectly bound up with the life of humanity. The collective sins which killed Jesus brought him into conflict with the total life of humanity in the Kingdom of Evil. When we accept His God-consciousness and love, then we begin to live righteously. At this point the Kingdom of God comes to stand in the path of the Kingdom of Evil. Obviously, new elements other than left-wing have entered into this conception.

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 151.

[2] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 99.

[3] Ibid., pp. 174-175.

Rauschenbusch's emphasis on the preeminent role of the Kingdom must be seen as his rejection of the following:

1. Spiritualize the Kingdom: Origen and the Pietists[1]
2. Equate the Kingdom and the church: Augustine[2]
3. Equate the Kingdom and the invisible church: Reformers[3]
4. Kingdom is consistently eschatological: Weiss and Schweitzer[4]

Under the stimulus, then, of his sectarian background, and of the further influence of American theology generally; and under the impact of liberal Ritschlianism, the role of the Kingdom became preeminent as the key to Jesus and the key to the new theology. All this caused Rauschenbusch to reject some very ancient and well known patterns in seeking to delineate the role of the Kingdom.

C. The Response to the Kingdom: Discipleship and Apostolate Leading to the Cross and Cultural Conflict

Rauschenbusch's initial religious experience was divided into two parts. First was the experience of conversion and then the experience of discipleship. Regarding the former he said:

> I am out in a far country and I want to get home to my country and I do not want to tend hogs any longer, and so, I came to my Father, and I began to pray for help and got it; and I got my own religious experience.[5]

---

[1] *De Principiis*, II, xi, 2-3; for Pietism see, August Herman Francke's *Wie man Heilige Schrift zu seiner warhren Erbauung lesen sollte* (1815) or Philip Spener's *Katechismus*.

[2] *City of God*, XX, 6-10.

[3] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Education, 1930), II, No. 4, 220-259.

[4] Johannes Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (1892) and Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1906). If Rauschenbusch had faced crisis theology, he would have found within some variations a view which considers the Kingdom paradoxical: it exists for the faithful and is *incognito* for the world. See, Emil Brunner, *The Theology of Crisis*, pp. 108-109.

[5] Dores Robinson Sharpe, *Walter Rauschenbusch*, p. 43.

Interpreting this conversionist experience, Rauschenbusch wrote with utter candor:

> Such as it was, it was of everlasting value to me. It turned me permanently and I thank God with all my heart for it. It was a tender mysterious experience. It influenced my soul down to its depths. Yet, there was a great deal in it that was not really true.[1]

With this touching pietistic experience in the background starting at the age of seventeen, he 'wished to preach and save souls.'[2] In order, to preach he resolved to live literally by the teaching and spirit of Jesus. The new discipleship experience was described in these words:

> I wanted to do hard work for God. Indeed, one of the great thoughts that came upon me was that I ought to follow Jesus Christ in my personal life, and die over again his death. I felt that every Christian ought to participate in the dying of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in that way help to redeem humanity, and it was that very thought that gave my life its fundamental direction in the doing of Christian work.[3]

This experience of discipleship occurred in his Seminary course in Rochester 1885-1886. Regarding this experience, Sharpe comments:

> In the light of this and his consequent course of action, I hold that this contact with Jesus and his decision to live Christ's way of life, had as much to do with his social enlightenment as anything else. Like the Apostle Paul, Walter Rauschenbusch met Jesus--and all life was different. Jesus changed Walter Rauschenbusch and Walter Rauschenbusch changed the course of American Christianity.[4]

Note in this discipleship passage the following emphases:

1. The desire to live literally by the teaching and spirit of Jesus
2. The desire to follow Jesus Christ
3. The desire to die over again Christ's death

Through the years after Seminary from 1886 to his death in 1918 were to bring some changes and additions to this discipleship-literalism, it is clear from his last book that the essence of this continued with him to the very end.

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

[3] Quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 57.

[4] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

Speaking of the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount in A Theology for the Social Gospel (1917) Rauschenbusch declares:

> If the present chastisement of God purges our intellects of capitalistic and upper-class iniquities, we shall no longer damn these sayings by calling them eschatological, but shall exhibit them as anticipations of the fraternal ethics of democracy and prophecies of social common sense.

Thus at the end of his career the most radical teachings of Jesus were still real possibilities for ethics and, in addition, were common sense for corporate social life. Throughout this outline of his approach to the Kingdom of God we shall see the adaptations which he made to his earlier views.[2]

Throughout his life, at every stage, discipleship is a controlling conception. His first really organized attempt to express social concerns was the Brotherhood of the Kingdom organized in 1892 under the leadership of Leighton Williams, Nathaniel Schmidt, Samuel Zane Batten and Rauschenbusch. The aim was to "permeate modern social movements with the social ideal and to attempt this by emphasizing Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom of God, the central ideal of the Gospel."[3]

In 1893 the Brotherhood issued a pamphlet setting for the "Spirit and Aims of the Brotherhood." Under Section VII, setting forth the aims of the new movement the following are the first four:

1. Every member shall be his personal life exemplify obedience to the ethics of Jesus.

2. He shall propagate the thoughts of Jesus to limits of his ability in private conversation, by correspondence, and through pulpit, platform and press.

---

[1] P. 158.

[2] These adaptations are seen in the attempt to socialize love, pp 142, 185, 261; to re-define the apostolate, p. 145; relation of neighbor love to God's love, p. 181; anabaptist form in relation to Calvinist content, p. 176 and in other parts of the chapter.

[3] Quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., p. 117.

3. He shall lay special stress on the social aims of Christianity, and shall endeavour to make Christ's teaching concerning wealth operative in the church.

4. On the other hand, he shall take pains to keep in contact with the common people, and to infuse the religious spirit into efforts for social amelioration.[1]

Clearly the necessity and the possibility of following Christ are indicated in the platform of this Brotherhood of the Kingdom.

Apparently, one of the crucial developments leading to the Brotherhood of the Kingdom as a lecture by the father of Leighton Williams delivered at Brown University. In this address, "Jesuits as a Missionary Order," he portrayed an ideal society of missionaries which should combine self-sacrifice of a Protestant type with a true Society of Jesus.[2]

What we have here is a radical emphasis on the imitation of Christ based on the Jesus of the synoptic Gospels mediated through the Anbaptist stress on discipleship plus modern conceptions of social concern. A very revealing experience in this connection was Rauschenbusch's attendance at the famour Oberammergau Passion Play in Bavaria. He was amazed at the "evangelical purity" of the play. He explained this by the "rationalism" of Weiss and Daisenberger and by the Gospels themselves which always make us less ecclesiastical and more Christian. He is pleased in many ways with the impersonation of the Christus--probably it was as satisfying as human character can make it. Yet Rauschenbusch was not really satisfied, emphasizing these reasons:

> The fault is not with Anton Lang nor with the writers of the play. It lies with the conception of Christ held by the entire church. The Christ of theology and of the sacraments was Christ who came to die an atoning death which would make pardon and eternal life possible for men. His task was to suffer; his chief characteristic was love to men and submission to the Father's will. But in the Gospels we see a Christ whose task it was to set up the Reign of God on earth, and whose dominant

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 122. [2] Vernon Parker Bodein, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

> characteristic was a passionate love for men and for righteousness, and a hatred for covetousness and hypocrisy. He was a Samson who shook the twin pillars of Church and State till those who sat on the roof were pale with fear.[1]

Rauschenbusch continues by placing the Oberammergau Christology in its historical perspective:

> The traditional passive Christ is inadequate to fill the part. . . . The Christ of Oberammergau lacks dramatic power because he lacks human development. . . . The struggle in Gethsemene becomes only a shrinking from something that is sure and fixed. It is the Logos Christ of the Fourth Gospel passing through with all supernal tranquility.
>
> The History of Oberammergau is a cross section of the history of religion and civilization during the past three-hundred years. It has passed from the course of humor and brutal emotions that appealed to medieval audiences to sensitiveness and naturalness demanded by modern taste. It has passed through legendary decorations and superstitious supernaturalism to the simplicity of the Gospel story. But the effort to reach Christ is not yet over.
>
> Nevertheless precisely in its deficiencies the play is a wonderful demonstration of the incomparable interest and power of Jesus Christ. Through all history he has been seen through a haze, darkly. Yet he has always laid hold of the souls of men and shaken them with a sense of the tragic solemnity of his divine life. The sin of the world is no trifle. It killed Jesus.[2]

Obviously this eloquent "review" of the world's most famous passion play makes sense only against the background of Rauschenbusch's quest for the synoptic Jesus who can be followed, obeyed and imitated. It is, by implication, an attempt to make the Lordship of Christ real in the ethical realm, both personal and social. It is a protest against docetism in any form in order to make the humanity of Jesus both real and contagious. To be sure, it runs the risk of kenoticism which empties Christ of all divine meaning in a desperate attempt to conserve the humanity. But Rauschenbusch's last paragraph something of the wonder and awe which he felt as he contemplated the power of Christ, the Lord of committed disciples.

In subsequent paragraphs we must take this general concept of discipleship and show how Rauschenbusch adapted and utilized it in his larger system of of Christian social thought.

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Religion of the Passion Play," Colgate-Rochester Rauschenbusch Scrapbook, III, 21.

[2] Ibid.

1. He correlated discipleship with the Kingdom concept thereby socializing the meaning of the term

This emphasis is clear in *Christianizing the Social Order*:

> The Kingdom of God is the first and the most essential dogma of the Christian faith. It is also the lost social ideal of Christendom. No man is a Christian in the full sense of original discipleship until he has made the Kingdom of God the controlling purpose of his life, and no man is intellectually prepared to understand Jesus Christ until, he has understood the meaning of the Kingdom of God.[1]

Or again, he writes:

> Every man who today realizes the Kingdom of God as the supreme good, can reaffirm his own baptism as dedication to the social ideal and the leadership of Jesus who initiated it. Such a social interpretation of our personal discipleship will bring us into closer spiritual agreement with the original aim of Christianity.[2]

The clear implication of this is that we are to follow Jesus not only in personal ethical issues but in the larger social challenges as well.

2. At times Rauschenbusch appears to have shifted the focus from the historical Jesus to union with God in the same way Jesus had union with God

The point still stands despite the fact that President Strong of Rochester Theological Seminary mildly criticed *A Theology for the Social Gospel* for leaving out the "union with Christ" or Christ mysticism which was the foundation of his *Systematic Theology*, three volumes (1907-1909). Rauschenbusch replied that his own theology was a Christo-centric as Strong's.[3]

In Rauschenbusch's *Why I Am a Baptist* series he declared that "to become a disciple of Jesus means to learn to think of God and live with Him as Jesus did, and to let all life be transformed by that new faith and knowledge."[4]

---

[1] P. 49. [2] *The Social Principles of Jesus*, p. 52.

[3] Sharpe, *op. cit.*, p. 433.

[4] *Why I Am a Baptist* (Reprinted from the *Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin*, Dec. 1938), p. 16.

This same kind of theocentric imitation is seen in this passage:

> The main thing is to have God; to live in Him; to have Him live in us; to think His thoughts; to love what he loves and hate what He hates; to realize His presence; to feel His holiness and to be Holy because He is Holy; even in tribulation to be happy and trustful; to join hands in the great purpose of God and to be lifted up to greatness of vision and faith and hope with Him--that is the blessed life.[1]

In any case, both the Christocentric and the theocentric concepts of discipleship assume that one can fully follow, obey and imitate the Divine object. This seems to be the case whether the stress is on Jesus Christ or on God the Father.[2] It is precisely this point which Visser t' Hooft considers the essence of the sectarianism of the earlier social gospel in general and Rauschenbusch in particular.[3]

3. All history must be judged by the spirit of Jesus

Discipleship is more than an ethical relationship between Christ and the individual; or, even Christ and the social order. The authority of Christ implied in discipleship extends to all history, particularly when Christ is stripped of false accretions from theology and sacramentarianism. In his essay on Introduction to the Study of Church History written in 1905, he said:

> The spirit of Jesus is the ultimate canon by which every historical personality, institution or movement must be judged, and our personal absorption of his mind and spirit is the ultimate qualification for a really useful study of the history of the church.[4]

The emphasis is on the essence and spirit of Jesus purged of all accretions. This emphasis is a union of the more primitive sectarian elements with modern thought. In a sermon published in 1909 Rauschenbusch affirmed the following:

---

[1] Rochester Baptist Monthly, XI (Nov. 1897), 1.

[2] See essay affirming the basic agreement of Walter Rauschenbusch and Augustus H. Strong by S. Fraser Langford in The Chronicle, XIV, 3-19.

[3] The Background of the Social Gospel in America, pp. 37, 51, 64.

[4] (Colgate Rochester Divinity School Scrapbook, III), 71.

> A truth familiar to Jesus and to his disciples was the pure spirituality of the new religion. To strip religion of all forms and make it purely a matter of love to God and man was so immense an innovation that we have hardly come in sight of it yet.[1]

4. The new social movement demands a new discipleship or apostolate as well as a new evangelism

He likens the situation to the apostolic times when there was a deep "fellow-feeling for social misery and from the consciousness of a great historical opportunity." In the midst of this Jesus bade his disciples to:

> . . . pray for laborers for the harvest and then made them answer their own prayers by sending them out two by two to proclaim the Kingdom of God. That was the beginning of the world-wide mission of Christianity.
>
> The situation is repeated on a vaster scale today. If Jesus stood today amid our modern life with that outlook on the condition of all humanity. . .and with the same heart of divine humanity beating in him, he would create a new apostolate to meet new needs in a new harvest time of history.[2]

What is new about the new apostolate?

First, ability and ambition are still to lead but they must be yoked to the service of all. "The old way to leadership was to knock others down and climb up on them; the new way is to get underneath and boost."[3] Therefore, service is the key of the new apostolate and service is not incompatible with ability and ambition when yoked for the larger social good.

Second, selfish acquisition of money is ruled out in the new apostolate: "Freely ye received; freely give. Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses; no wallet for your journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff; for the laborer is worthy of his food." He cites Francis of Assisi,

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Unspoken Thoughts of Jesus," Modern Sermons by World Scholars, ed. by Robert Scott and W. C. Stiles (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1909), p. 31.

[2] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 415.

[3] The Social Principles of Jesus, p. 108.

Peter Waldus, Wycliffe, John Wesley and William Booth as illustrations of this principle that support is only enough to live in health and no more.[1] The Christian ministry is now under this law of leadership where once the priests were upper-class, rich with unearned incomes, pervaded by graft and with a domineering spirit. The general trend is "toward intelligent service on plain pay" such as educators, judges, scientists and doctors. This is also true in politics unless there is graft. The big problem, therefore, is with business. Can it be brought under the law of service? Or, is commerce constitutionally incapable of this moral axiom? Actually, the only question is whether "business leaders will voluntarily turn their backs on such misuse of power or have a change forced on them?"[2]

Third, "the apostolate of a new age must do the work of the sower."[3]

The sower sows new seed with new truths. He may never see the results but he can wait because the powers of life are on his side. This is like leaven in the meal; like the mustard seed becoming a tree. A perfect example is Robert Owen whose cooperative communities failed but whose ideas penetrated and stimulated Chartism, Rochdale Co-ops, and other radical movements.

Thus, today the new apostolate will lead mankind slowly but surely into new ways of life.

Fourth, the new apostolate will not be discouraged by suffering and opposition, both of which are inevitable.[4]

Kingsley and Maurice, the English Christian socialists were bitterly assailed and misunderstood at the time of their ministries but today are acclaimed as the finest products of their time. Likewise, Rudolph Todt, the

---

[1] Ibid. [2] The Social Principles of Jesus, p. 109.

[3] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 416.

[4] Ibid., pp. 417, 419.

German pastor who showed that the New Testament and socialism have a close affinity.

Therefore, the new leaders will not be surprised by opposition, suffering and rejection. Indeed they will expect this as a normal experience.

Fifth--and perhaps the newest principles of the group--*the new apostolate is not limited to Christians or to churchmen*.

This is clearly brought out in Rauschenbusch's book on social work published in 1912 under the title *Unto Me*. He writes with his usual eloquence:

> Social workers are in the direct line of apostolic succession. Like the Son of Man they seek and save the lost. Their work is redemptive work . . . they are treading step by step in the footprints of Jesus of Nazareth. They are doing with the large resources of modern organization what He did in Galilee, and they have a right to feel the nearness and love of their Heavenly Father in doing it just as he felt it. . . .*They are doing Christian work when they do social work, even if they themselves disclaim religious motives or even repudiate religious faith.*[1]

Rauschenbusch anticipates the objections which people will make to this oceanic conception of discipleship. Particularly the objection that this is not a specifically Christian kind of discipleship. He answers boldly:

> I should reply that on the contrary they may be more peculiarly Christian than any other kind of religious experience.
>
> It [social work] loads them [the social workers] up with the troubles of others and they bear their griefs and carry their sorrows like the one who 'was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.'
>
> No one will move very far in the way of social relief without colliding with strong and active forces, perhaps with the controlling forces of society, and being punished for interference with their income.
>
> In that case the social worker comes into very intimate touch with Christ by sharing his sufferings for humanity, for Jesus too got hurt because he collided with the selfish interests of the ruling classes. If a man attacks child labor or the under-payment of women in industry, and finds himself misunderstood or abused, or perhaps without position and income, his pain is part of that vicarious suffering by which the redemption of humanity is achieved. Without the shedding of blood in some form there has never been cessation of sin.
>
> For ages the cross of Christ has stood at the center of Christian theology. But many good men who are loud in their insistence on the cross as the only means of salvation have apparently never had any experience with the pain of the cross. They do not 'bear the marks of the Lord Jesus.' There are no scars on them anywhere. Their religion has served to make them respected. All men like them for their goodness. But their goodness was never so good that it waked up the Devil.[2]

---

[1] *Unto Me* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1912), pp. 13-14. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

This radical oceanic Christianity (to use a phrase of Vergilius Ferm) was not spelled out only in terms of social workers. As a matter of fact, the major stress was on the special mission of socialism in this larger sense of following Christ even when He is not consciously accepted. Documentation for this will be given special attention in chapter three on "Calvinist and Catholic Universalism" where this socialist "kairos" is developed primarily by way of Ragaz and Kutter.

The major conclusion at this point is that just as Rauschenbusch has a Christocentric and theocentric object for discipleship he also has a conscious and unconscious discipleship. Or, one might say an explicit and implicit discipleship. Surely here is a conception which deviates from traditional Christianity as much as any in Rauschenbusch.

Sixth, the new apostolate will go beyond the sins of the disposition and the sins of the flesh to the social sins.

Rauschenbusch pointed out in his essay The New Evangelism that in the past the church has boldly condemned:

> . . .drunkenness, sexual impurity, profanity; it has fostered gentleness and pity, and it has been largely successful in this teaching. It has also drawn the line against Sabbath-breaking, dancing and card playing and theatre-going, but it has not been successful in maintaining that line. In general the community has risen toward the level of the church in private and domestic virtue and the church has drifted toward the level of respectibility in regard to amusements. As a result of both movements the gap has been lessened. The morality of the church is not much more than what prudence, respectibility and good breeding also demand.[1]

Then Rauschenbusch analyzes the relation of the church to large social questions:

> When we pass from private and domestic life to political and business life the matter is worse. About the most pressing questions arising there, the church is dumb. . . the moral guide of humanity is silent where authoritative speech is today most needed. Where it does speak, it is often on the wrong side. When we consider the ideas prevalent in the churches, their personnel, and their sources of income, has the Church a message of

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, The New Evangelism, 1904, (The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Scrapbook, II).

> repentance and an evangel for this modern world?
>
> One important and growing class in our population is largely alienated from the Church--namely, the industrial wage-workers. . .This constitutes the spiritual barrier to evangelistic efforts as soon as they go beyond the young people of the families now in the churches. Our evangelistic call strikes an invisible wall and comes back in hollow echoes.
>
> The Church has passed under the spiritual domination of the commercial and professional classes. I do not mean that they alone compose the membership; but they furnish its chief support, do its work and their ethics and views of life determine the thought of the church more than we realize.
>
> They [working people] disapprove of the Christianity of the churches not because it is too good but because it is not good enough.
>
> In the State churches the State has dominated; in the free churches the capitalist class dominates. Both influences are worldly--in favor of things as they are and against ideals which animate common people.[1]

Therefore, the church must speak as boldly regarding social sins as the church has spoken on the sins of the disposition and the sins of the flesh. Likewise, the disciple will follow Christ not only in personal purity (though many would disagree with Rauschenbusch's pietistic reading of these issues) but also in the deeper, ethical challenges of the social order, especially in the economic aspect of the social order.

Thus the new apostolate yokes ambition and ability to service, rules out selfish acquisition of money, must do the work of the sower in planting radical new ideas, will not be discouraged by opposition and suffering, is not limited to Christians or churchmen and will follow Christ in rejecting social as well as personal sins.

5. A new social order will make it easier to follow Jesus

It became a favorite idea of Rauschenbusch and subsequent advocates of the social gospel that today one cannot follow Christ in the unregenerate social order; but that when the new social order comes then the social order will assist, not hamper, discipleship.

In _Christianity and the Social Crisis_, Rauschenbusch lists six _ifs_ which constitute the hopes of the social gospel for a new context in which the new apostolate can really function.

---

[1] _Ibid_.

These, then, are the six ifs leading to the conclusion of the proper discipleship context:

1. If production could be organized on a basis of cooperative fraternity
2. If distribution could at least approximately be determined by justice (Does the phrase remind one of Reinhold Niebuhr--approximate justice?)
3. If all men could be conscious that their labor contributed to the welfare of all and that their personal well-being was dependent on the prosperity of the Commonwealth
4. If predatory business and parasitic wealth ceased and all men lived only by their labor
5. If the luxury of unearned wealth no longer made us feverish with covetousness and a simpler life became the fashion
6. If our time and strength were not used up either in getting a bare living or in amassing unstable wealth and we had more leisure for the higher pursuits of the mind and the soul[1]

What conclusion does Rauschenbusch draw from these suppositions?

> . . . then there might be a chance to live such a life of gentleness and brotherly kindness and tranquillity of heart as Jesus desired for men. It may be that the Cooperative Commonwealth would give us the first chance in history to live a really Christian life without retiring from the world, and would make the Sermon on the Mount a philosophy of life feasible for all who care to try.[2] (Italics mine)

Social reconstruction is crucial. If the social order goes down, the church goes down with it. If the church can cooperate in changing the social order, then the church will rise to the newer and higher life. If the ifs are taken care of, then following Jesus and expressing the Sermon on the Mount are real possibilities.

Part of the foregoing is logically inconsistent with the emphasis on following Jesus now despite suffering and opposition. Nevertheless, the development of the new apostolate and discipleship in response to the Kingdom is a characteristic aspect of Rauschenbusch's modified sectarianism. Jesus can be followed in both personal and social situations, and in small-scale and large-scale groups. In summary, the position is this:

---

[1] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 341. [2] Ibid.

1. He correlated discipleship with the Kingdom concept, thereby socializing the meaning of the term.

2. At times Rauschenbusch appears to have shifted the focus from the historical Jesus to union with God in the same way that Jesus had union with God.

3. All history must be judged by the real unadulterated essence of the teaching of Jesus.

4. The new social movement demands a new discipleship or apostolate as well as a new evangelism.

5. A new social order will make it possible to follow Jesus.

Rauschenbusch locates much of his discipleship emphasis among the Continental left-wing. In his Boston address on "The Prophetic Character of the Anabaptist Movement," he said:

> The Anabaptists took Jesus Christ as their leader and the Holy Spirit as their inward light, and that combination raised them with a single uplift far beyond their time and gave their movement a prophetic power and grandeur. Jesus and the Holy Spirit will do the same for us, provided that we dare to trust their leadership.[1]

In another passage from the Taylor lectures the Rochester social prophet wrote:

> Genuine prophecy springs up where fervent religious experience combines with a democratic spirit, strong social feeling, and free utterance. Some sense of antagonism between the will of God and the present order of things is necessary to ignite the will of the prophet.
>
> This was the combination which produced the Hebrew prophets. *We have the same combination in those manifold radical bodies which preceded and accompanied the Reformation*. They all tended toward the same type of primitive Christianity. Strong fraternal feeling, simplicity and democracy of organization, more or less communistic ideas about property, an attitude of passive obedience or conscientious objection toward the coercive and militaristic governments of the time, opposition to the sel-

---

[1] *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, *op. cit.*

> fish and oppressive Church, *a genuine faith in the practibility of the ethics of Jesus*, and, as the secret power in it all, belief in an inner experience of regeneration and an inner light which interprets the outer word of God. These radical bodies did not produce as many great individuals as we might have expected because their intellectuals and leaders were always killed off or silenced. But their communities were prophetic. They have been the forerunners of the modern world. They stood against war, against capital punishment, against slavery and against coercion in matters of religion before others thought of it.[1] (Italics mine)

The passage is concluded with Rauschenbusch again insisting that the sowing of the Anabaptist seed brought both the Puritan and modern harvest:

> It was largely due to their influence that the Puritan Revolution had its prophetic elements of leadership. The Free Churches through the world, consciously or unconsciously, clearly or dimly, have passed beyond the official types of orthodox Protestantism and have taken on some of the characteristics of the early radicals.[2]

These passages suggest the following ideas which appear in his view of discipleship:

1. The double emphasis on Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, suggesting his movement back and forth from Christocentric to theocentric discipleship

2. The practicality of the ethics of Jesus, thus making discipleship a possibility

3. The concept of the sower whereby the Anabaptist influence, like concentric circles in a pond of water, moves out to ever wider influence

4. The suffering, martyrdom and death which this early witness brought about

5. The socio-fraternal-communistic feeling of the Anabaptists, suggesting a social dimension to discipleship

In addition to the Reformation radicals and their influence on Rauschenbusch's view of property, there is considerable evidence that Tolstoy, Russia's greatest sectarian radical, considerably influenced him. His four major books all contain quotations from Tolstoy with glowing approval.

For example, in Christianity and the Social Crisis Rauschenbusch writes:

> When the religious teachings of Tolstoi first became known in the 80's they gave many of us a shock of surprise by asserting with the voice of

---

[1] *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, pp. 195-196. [2] *Ibid*., p. 196.

> faith that these (the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount) were the obligatory and feasible laws of Christian conduct.[1]

After showing that the teachings of Jesus on wealth are radical, he observes:

> The man on the street nowadays is cynical enough about the rich, but he would not stand for the radicals teachings of Saint Francis or Tolstoy. Nor has the Church ever backed the judgments of her Master except with many qualifications.[2]

Again, he writes of the Russian sectarian radical:

> Any man in whom the Jesus-strain reappears clearly is felt to be some kind of super-man. If Tolstoy, for instance, had never begun to follow Christ in his life, he would be simply one of a group of brilliant Russian novelists. Since he received something of the mind of Jesus into his mind, he became one of the prophetic figures of our age and no one can tell how much he contributed, through others, to enable Russia newly free, to make the one sincere and penetrating utterance on behalf of democracy and peace in the Spring and Summer of 1917.[3]

Thus, the emphasis on rejection of acquisitive riches in the new apostolate was reinforced both by his studies of the earlier Reformation radicals as well as of Tolstoy. In saying this we are not overlooking Tolstoy's emphasis on the Kingdom of God.[4]

Finally, the emphasis upon the necessity of a friendly social order in order to make discipleship possible is clearly indicated in Rauschenbusch's analysis of the fateful crushing of the Anabaptists.

His essay on "The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology" (1907) contains this important point:

> The Anabaptist movement was the most purely religious movement of all the movements and that was stamped out because the social classes within which it spread did not command enough political power to protect it. Any theory of religious and moral movements which separates them from the patriotic and social movements of the nations is wholly contradicted by history. The more we comprehend history, the more we see the organic and

---

[1] Pp. 314-315. [2] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 293.

[3] A Theology for the Social Gospel, pp. 164-165.

[4] Rauschenbusch has a long quotation from Tolstoy in his Social Principles of Jesus, p. 50, supporting the Kingdom idea.

inseparable unity of all life.[1]

This whole idea is spelled out more sharply along class lines in another place. He points out how the Peasants Rising in 1525 and the Anabaptist movement expressed the social and religious ideals of the common people, yet both were quenched in steams of blood. While it is true, quotating Balthasar Hubmaier, that truth is immortal, nevertheless "for a definite historical victory a given truth must depend on the class which makes that truth its own and fights for it."[2] Pre-Reformation radicals lacked thus support and thus the papacy and clergy killed them off. The Lutherans and Calvinists made such alliances, however unsavory, and triumphed. On the other hand, Rauschenbusch observed:

> . . . the classes within which Anabaptism gained lodgment lacked that concrete power, and so the Anabaptist movement, which promised for a short time to be the real Reformation of Germany, just as it came to be the real Reformation of England in the Commonwealth, died a useless and despised death.[3]

Rauschenbusch, then, found roots for two more of his discipleship themes in the sectarians:

1. The Acquisitive spirit is ruled out in a life of simplicity and voluntary poverty.

2. The crushing of previous radical movements calls for the embodiment of great religious truths in a social movement whose triumph will eventually cooperate with discipleship instead of going against it.

Although Rauschenbusch's Why I Am a Baptist booklet reaffirms the Baptist conception of a gathered, disciplined congregation, he seems to set aside this more sharply defined conception of the Christian life in favor of a broader moral definition of being essentially Christian whether one is formally so or whether one operates outside Christian faith and life. The roots of this idea, as we will suggest, comes from the Christian socialists of Europe.[1]

---

[1] American Journal of Theology, XI, No. 1 (January, 1907), 123.

[2] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 401. [3] Ibid., p. 402.

Leading scholars of Anabaptistica in our day agree with Rauschenbusch in making discipleship a basic theme of the Christian life. Already we have quoted Robert Friedmann, scholar of the left-wing, who considers discipleship the essence of Anabaptism along with the two major descriptive categories of existential Christianity expressed in brotherly love, and Kingdom-mindedness.[2] Dean H. S. Bender has long contended that discipleship is the major motif in Anabaptist thought: their major theme was not faith (though this was a basic theme[3]) but following, Nachfolge Christi.[4] Dean bender has stressed that the Continental left-wing did not mean the discipleship of Thomas a' Kempis's Imitation of Christ which is "basically . . . mysticism mixed with asceticism."[5] Moreover, in a' Kempis "the social dimension is almost completely lacking and criticism of the total social and cultural order with a view to the establishment of a full Christian order in the brotherhood and church of the living Christ in the midst of the present world is missing."[6] Actually, "Thomas a' Kempis and all those many who follow in his train evade the conflict with the world, avoid the constructive labor of establishing the true church, and thus escape the real cross-bearing experience of true discipleship. There is more kinship between Thomas and the later Pietists than the Anabaptists."[7]

---

[1] The Influence of Calvinist and Catholic Transformationists, Chapter V and especially pp. 400-419 regarding Ragaz and Kutter.

[2] P. 29.

[3] G. Fischer, "Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way," Mennonite Quarterly Review, Vol. XXVIII (1954), an essay by a Vienna Lutheran minister showing that justification and sanctification existed in mutual tension among Anabaptists.

[4] "The Anabaptist Vision," Church History, Vol. XIII (1944).

[5] "The Anabaptist Theology of Discipleship," Mennonite Quarterly Review, Vol. XXIV (1950).

[6] Ibid. [7] Ibid.

Arising in the context of the death penalty and banishment, Anabaptist could not provide the soil for an ethic of responsibility. Part of this Rauschenbusch took from the liberal conception of responsibility and part of this conception he ascribed to Anabaptist influence followed by amplification among the Puritan and free churches generally. With less tyranny and oppression in America and England the concern for social action and social responsibility freely developed. But, in any case, the Continental radicals are the source and fountain-head of his whole stress on sectarianism. And nothing was more characteristic of this emphasis than his concept of discipleship.

Visser t' Hooft was one of the first to detect the sectarian dimension in Rauschenbusch and the early social gospel thinkers generally--but he never followed through on the insight because he believed that the idealistic-scientific-Enlightenment elements predominated.[1] "It is," according to Visser t' Hooft, "the sectarian interpretation qualified by modern scientific ideas of evolution and sociological relationships and universalized so as to become a social ethics for humanity at large."[2]

Visser t' Hooft describes and then criticizes the methodology of the discipleship approach which characterized the American social movement as follows:

> The general method followed is to deduce a number of principles from the teaching of Jesus and confront the social order with each of them in turn. There is no clearly systematized scheme in which all these principles are put in their logical place. There is no attempt to arrive at an _a priori_ theory of society based on the gospel. The strength of the method lies in its flexibility and readiness to take account of reality in all its diverse forms. Its weakness lies in its lack of coherence and unity. There is little thorough analysis of the heart of New Testament ethics which stands behind all the principles concerned and would make them a coherent whole. Some select one set of principles, others another set. Nevertheless, a good deal of agreement is evident. The one principle from which they may be said to derive is that of brotherhood. In one form or another this appears in all writings on the subject and it is used as the

---

[1] Visser t' Hooft, _op. cit._, p. 161. [2] _Ibid._, p. 64.

> inclusive principle for Christian social life. Brotherhood is not a hope or a desire, not a potential factor in human relations that may be realized in the future. It is not dependent on the conscious recognition of God and Christ. It is an actual fact that needs only to be recognized. It is unconditional and universal, for all men are children of the same Father even if they do not know it. It is the 'one indestructible, irrepealable, indubitible fact about human nature. The fact of the Divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood is the only natural law.'[1]

Over against this Visser t' Hooft suggests that relative natural law has been the major Catholic and Protestant concept as valid in the state of sin as the absolute natural law of the New Testament is valid in the state of perfection. Because of the state of sin, main-line Protestant and Catholic ethics rule out the direct application of New Testament ethics to society as a whole.

On the other hand, Visser t' Hooft's Stone lectures published under the title of The Kingship of Christ (1947) developed the Lordship and Kingship of Christ as the dominant theological motif in the church and state struggles in recent European life. Likewise, the World Council of Churches at Evanston in its official message August 31, 1954, included these words:

> It [the Christian hope] is to enter with Christ into the suffering and despair of men, sharing with them the great secret of the Kingdom which they do not expect.
>
> Does your congregation live for itself, or for the world around it and beyond it? Does its common life, and does the daily work of its members in the world, affirm the lordship of Christ or deny it?[2]

Another attack on the discipleship ethic of the early social gospel came from James Dombrowski's The Early Days of Christian Socialism. He accused these early leaders of assuming that the recovery of the pure ethical teachings of Jesus by scientific research would transform society. They overlooked the objective social conditions which would not yield to ethical idealism. The reason they overlooked these rugged facts is that the leaders of the social gospel were middle-class liberals rather than working-class radicals.

---

[1] Visser t' Hooft, op. cit., p. 51.

[2] James Dombrowski, The Early Days of Christian Socialism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), pp. 24-25.

While Dombrowski refers to Rauschenbusch four times he includes him in the foregoing characterization only by implication. Much of his critique is true. But it is grossly unfair to lump Rauschenbusch with thinkers who did not have a theory of social institutions. Most of his career was spent doing just that. Rauschenbusch was optimistic. He was a scholar and not an actual proletarian leader of a leftist movement. He did underestimate the element of self-interest in every ethical pretension. He was a liberal more than a radical. He did believe that the pure essence of Jesus would have a tremendous effect on human culture. All this is true. Visser t' Hooft is more profound in noting that Rauschenbusch leaped from the ethics of Jesus to an analysis of society perhaps too easily. Yet never did he propose a disembodied ethic of Jesus. Perhaps the classic refutation of this was his argument that the Anabaptists were crushed precisely because the lower classes with which he claims they were affiliated, were defeated by other more powerful classes in alliance with Lutheran, Calvinist and Catholic parties.

The response to the Kingdom, then, is discipleship and apostolate leading to the cross and cultural conflict. This is a basic theme in Rauschenbusch. It is a theme moulded by considerable sectarian influence.

D. The Function of the Kingdom: Christianize the Social Order by the Abolition of Unjust Privilege While Changing Semi-Christian Institutions

The function of the Kingdom is to Christianize the social order. To Christianize the social order "means bringing it into harmony with the ethical convictions which we identify with Christ."[1]

The reason the Kingdom is adapted to "inspire and guide us in Christianizing the social order" is as follows: it is a religion for this earth and for this present life, it wastes no time on religious paraphernalia, it gives religious value to the plain man's job, it deals with bodies and souls and, finally, it demands an ethic for public life. Therefore, we must survey those areas of life which have been Christianized. By this term he does not mean perfection but a basic constitutional change which permits this institution to be squared with the demands of Christian morality. This suggests four institutions essentially but not perfectly changed: (a) the family from despotism to democracy, (b) the church from despotism and superstition to democracy, (c) public education from aristocracy and unChristian methods to democracy, (d) the state from special privilege to personal liberty and equal rights.

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, pp. 96, 125.

This leaves the economic order of Mammonism as the final crucial domain for Christianization. The poisons from this failure reach out into every part of the body politic including the church.

In each case, "the fundamental step toward Christianizing the social order. . . is the establishment of social justice by the abolition of unjust privilege. Logically, this would be the first step; ethically it is the most important step; practically, it is usually the last and the hardest."[1] Therefore, the function of the Kingdom is to further Christianize a semi-Christian social order by the abolition of unjust privilege as a part of the process of bringing it into harmony with the ethical convictions of Jesus Christ.

Once again, Rauschenbusch locates this conception within the sectarians. Observations like the following document this point:

> The Anabaptists believed in a religious transformation of social life . . . The Anabaptists entertained the social revolutionary hope under revolutionary hope under revolutionary guise. The Anabaptist movement was a religious movement with social aims.
>
> Anabaptism expressed most thoroughly the demand for the abolition of abuses in the government of the church.
>
> . . .It was also most consistent and thorough in purifying the worship of the church of ceremonialism.

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 96.

So far from destroying the standards of the moral law, the Anabaptists as a body sought to raise it.[1]

Rauschenbusch's materials on Puritanism are always scarcer than on the Continental radicals, particularly since he considered the latter the product of the former. Nevertheless, there are materials revealing how he rooted his concept of Christianization in the Puritans as well as the Anabaptists. For example, he shared the platform with Washington Gladden in Boston, November 30, 1908. The Springfield Daily Republican reported this address in which he clearly develops the concept of the English Puritans under Cromwell as "the prophets and creators of the modern world."[2] Then he makes the following affirmations:

1. In America these principles have triumphed more completely and are now accepted in large part by churches which formerly opposed them.

2. Today the industrial revolution demands that we extend to the industrial and economic orders these principles which were victorious in the Reformation non-conformists and the French Revolution.

3. The Baptists and Congregationalists are thus pledged by their past history to affiliate themselves with the new extension of democracy.

4. If we do this we will be spared an ugly social struggle and will "be the pioneer of the kingdom of God among the nations."[3]

Obviously, Rauschenbusch uses the term extension as a synonym for Christianization. There is a kind of inherent drive which reaches peaks in certain periods of history (to be discussed under part "J" of this chapter); an inherent drive toward ever wider areas of Christianization and socialization. The left-wing Christian movements were responsible for these secular movements which now have a momentum of their own. The modern church thus, in somewhat of a Marxian fashion, has only one option: to cooperate with its own democratic offspring through Christianization and extension or go down to defeat in reactionary oopposition. Or, to put it in historical terms: *Christianization moves from the Anabaptists to the Puritans to socialism*. This is the fundamental function of the Kingdom: to assist this dynamic historical movement through the removal of unjust privilege in the last remaining citadel of abuse, naely, the economic order. Throughout, the malleability, plasticity and pliability of the social order is assumed. The reform of the church is assumed to be no different from the reform of the social order. It awaits only on the committed decision of the new apostolate.

---

[1] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle (1903) op. cit.

[2] The Springfield Daily Republican, Dec. 1, 1908, p. 7. [3] Ibid.

Again, Rauschenbusch's utilization of the left-wing receives broad confirmation in current scholarship along with definite reservations on some points. Dean H. S. Bender writes on the meaning of the central emphasis of the Anabaptists:

> In essence the discipleship which the Anabaptists proclaimed was simply the bringing of the whole life under the Lordship of Christ, and the *transformation of this life, both personal and social*, after His image. From this point of view they subjected not only the whole social and cultural order to criticism, rejected what they found to be contrary to Christ, and attempted to put into actual practice His teachings as they understood them both ethically and sociologically.[1]
>
> This absolute disciplship applied to all areas of life. . . *It meant a Christianizing of all social relationships*, a substituting of the simplicity and sincerity of Christ for the pride and vanity of the world. . . Implicit in the basic Anabaptist theology of discipleship was a new order which was bound to come as the discipleship was practiced.[2]

On the other hand, the continental Anabaptists tended to have a strong eschatological expectation since their hopes for society as a whole were pessimistic *within* history. At this point Rauschenbusch borrows from the Puritan stream of Christian thought with its emphasis on "the renewal of the soul in God, a conscience void of offense, the will of God for church and society."[3]

---

[1] "The Anabaptist Theology of Discipleship," *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32. [3] John T. McNeill, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

His Boston address of 1908 emphasized the creative character of the Puritans for the whole idea of Christianizing the social order. (Christianize would be the wrong term if it meant the full Sermon on the Mount ethic; perhaps democratize or moralize might be the better terms.)

Yet, the current literature on Puritanism was not available to Rauschenbusch for assistance in delineating the relation of Puritanism to Wyclifistic Dissent, to Calvin, Zingli and Bucer, to the sectarian left in Switzerland and Holland, and to the whole economic order. The post-Rauschenbusch literature of Weber, Tawney, Miller, Knappen, Perry, R. Jones, Haller, Lindsay, Laski, Gooch and more recently at the University of Chicago through Nichols, Brauer and Mead is increasingly rich and illuminating. It suggests a much more complex relationship between Puritanism and Anabaptism. This particular problem is not fully settled although, as previously suggested, Irvin Horst's studies at Amsterdam promise to be definitive in the not too distant future.[1]

The function of the Kingdom, according to Rauschenbusch, is to Christianize the social order by the abolition of unjust privilege while changing semi-Christian institutions.

E. The Scope and Location of the Kingdom: A Universal Socio-Historical Reality Struggling with Pietistic Subjectivism, Other-Worldliness and Apocalypticism

The location of the kingdom is historical. It is rooted in the theocratic ideal of Israel which "meant the complete penetration of the national life by morality."[2] This was a present, contemporaneous focus for the work of the Kingdom. Precisely when this work was changed to an individualistic, withdrawal outlook do we find the decline of Jewish prophetism into "apocalyptic dreams and bookish calculations."[1] The mood of the Kingdom consciousness of the prophets is sombre, causing them to reject lullabys for the sounding of reveille!

---

[1] His first published note is called, "The Anabaptists in English Literature, a Research Note," Mennonite Quarterly Review, XXIX, 232-239. See also, Waldo Beach and H. Richard Niebuhr, "Ethics of Puritanism and Quakerism," Chapter 10, Christian Ethics, Sources of the Living Tradition (New York: The Ronald Press, 1955).

[2] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 8.

While Jesus was profoundly religious and was not a social reformer, He also presented a modified version of the historical message of the prophets: ". . .the Kingdom of God is now close at hand." (Mark 1:15)

Jesus focused his Kingdom message on all mankind, not just in relation to the Jews. This universalized the historical concern. Jesus also insisted that the fundamental realities of the Kingdom were present now. The Kingdom must be fully consummated in the future but this is only a greater degree of what already exists.

Two other factors helped make the Kingdom a historical reality. First the ethics of the Kingdom are based on love and love is the society-making quality. Love creates fellowship, organism, togetherness, and nowness. Second, the radical social hopes of the primitive church came to a brilliant expression in a unique society where conventional barriers broke down. History was invaded by a dynamic and many-sided new movement which included Christian democracy resulting in a real expression of community; a great program of welfare services and mutual aid; and a general stirring of divine discontent, opening up new possibilities for social change. The following passage climaxes Rauschenbusch's argument:

> Thus the spirit of primitive Christianity did not spread only sweet peace and tender charity, but the leaven of social unrest. It caused some to throw down their tools and quit work. It stirred women to break down the restraints of custom and modesty. It invaded the intimacies of domestic relations and threatened families with disruption. It awakened the slaves to a sense of worth and a longing for freedom which made slavery double irksome and strained their relation to their masters. It disturbed the patriotism and loyalty of citizens for their country, and intervened between the sovereign State and its subjects.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 42.

> Our argument here is simply this, that Christianity must have had a strong social impetus to evoke such stirrings of social unrest and discontent. It was not purely religious but also a democratic and social movement. Or to state it far more truly: it was so strongly and truly religious that it was of necessity democratic and social also.[1]

There the location of the Kingdom is historical through a theocratic prophetism concerned with current issues during the Old Testament. This moves on to Jesus who universalizes the present reality of the Kingdom for all mankind. In doing so, Jesus bases his work on the society-creating ingredient of love, makes provision for human need in mutual aid and launches a powerful new movement resulting in a series of revergerations within history. This is the new wine fermenting and bursting the old wineskins.

All this is not to say that the Kingdom is only in outside society rather than within the human heart. It is both. An exegetical note on the entos humon of Luke 17:20-21 finds Rauschenbusch observing: "The Greek phrase may mean either 'within you' or 'among you.' In either case it is an assertion of the presence of the Kingdom and a contradiction of the catastrophic expectations."[2]

Thus, Rauschenbusch lays the foundation for his argument which recognizes the start of the Kingdom in the individual yet with serious qualifications and warnings against the mystical and pietistic illusion locating the Kingdom only within. On the other hand, the fact that he concedes a certain inner dimension to the Kingdom does not mean that he really accepts this as the major location of the Kingdom. The major location is the Kingdom within history, a concrete, societal, historical experience. As a matter of fact, Rauschenbusch saw two major perils for the true understanding of the location of the Kingdom: the pietistic truncation of the Kingdom as solely within; and the other-worldly-apocalyptic locus of the Kingdom in heaven rather than on earth.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 139-140. [2] Ibid., p. 65. [3] Ibid., pp. 66-67.

The focus of the Kingdom within history and the rejection of pietism and otherworldliness have roots in Anabaptist thought. This is made clear in Rauschenbusch's remarkable address given to the German department of Rochester Theological Seminary, September 12, 1902, with the title, Die Geschichte der Idee des Reiches Gottes.[1]

After showing the roots of the Kingdom in the Bible, he traces its subsequent historical development. Augustine makes the error of identifying the church with the Kingdom. The mystics such as Tauler and Boehme join with the pietists in making the Kingdom within the hearts of men. However, the pietists also stress the Kingdom as the invisible communion of the reborn. Rauschenbusch prefers the Kingdom as the invisible congregation to the Roman identificationist formula but, actually, rejects both.

Once again the return to the correct view of the Kingdom which focuses on history starts with St. Francis. The crucial remarks are these:

> Another conception paved the way for the Reformation, starting with the noble Francis of Asissi and coming up in many smaller fellowships and yearnings of following centuries; and which has influenced the life of people deeper than we can recognize today yet. It was the attempt to earnestly take up the following of Christ, to accept the Gospel and the Sermon on the Mount as the law of life and to bring to reality again the ideal communion of the apostolic times. With that one did not stop with a personal pious life but one wanted to build the true communion of men according to God's will.
>
> On larger scale men like Savonarola, Wycliff, Hus, Zwingli and Calvin struggled for a similar energetic creation of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God should not only remain in the heart but it should be visibly embodied in the institutions of human life.
>
> This was not the passive retiring position of pietism but one tried to transform the state and made the moral powers of Christianity mobile even for the wider circles of life. The mistake of the attempt lay in that one tried to make the state not only moral but also religious. But the highest cultural values of today's life can be traced back to those attempts, to get at the original revolutionary power. Especially we in America still

---

[1] Bodein, in The Social Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch and its Relation to Religious Education, p. 22, mistakenly writes that this address was never published. Moehlman points out in the Crozer Quarterly, XXIII, p. 46, that it was published in Der Sendbote, Sept., 1902. The latter was the official publication of the German Baptists with which Rauschenbusch was affiliated before moving over to the Northern Baptists. The denomination has since changed its name to the North American Baptist General Conference with headquarters in a Chicago suburb, Forest Park.

live on the attempt of the Puritans to take theocracy seriously.[1]

Thus here we see Rauschenbusch starting with the pre-Reformation monastics and sectarians and their successors in later centuries for the rejection of subjective pietism. In addition, he observes with considerable satisfaction the rejection of a purely personalistic ethic citing the Calvinist-Puritan movements for the development of an ethic concerned with society as a whole.

One notes here a synthesis of Anabaptist form to the ethics (follow Christ, accept Sermon on the Mount and apostolic foundations) with a neo-Calvinist focus and locus in relation to the total community. This focus was universal, not tribal; historical, not apocalyptic or heavenly; starting inwardly but stressing the concrete outwardness of corporate life.

In this rejection of subjectivism, millennialism and otherworldliness Rauschenbusch was in line with what Robert Friedmann has shown to be one of the definitive struggles of the Anabaptists and other left-wing groups. As a matter of fact, he argues that pietism sapped the ethical vitality of Anabaptism in less than a hundred years through an emotional, individualistic, inner, subjectivism which had made peace with the status quo of social institutions.[2]

In one of Friedmann's very typical uses of outlines he puts it this way:

Pietism	Anabaptism
1. Experiential Christianity	1. Concrete or existential
2. Experience of one's own sinfulness, conversion, enjoyment of grace and edification	2. Imitation of Christ, discipleship, obedience and martyrdom

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "Die Geschichte der Idee des Reiches," (Rochester, N. Y., 1902) in the Rauschenbusch Scrapbook, pp. 14-15, at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

[2] See "Study I, Anabaptism and Pietism," in his Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries (Goshen: The Mennonite Historical Society, 1949); and his essay, "Anabaptism and Pietism," Mennonite Quarterly Review, Vol. XIV (April and July, 1940).

live on the attempt of the Puritans to take theocracy seriously.[1]

Thus here we see Rauschenbusch starting with the pre-Reformation monastics and sectarians and their successors in later centuries for the rejection of subjective pietism. In addition, he observes with considerable satisfaction the rejection of a purely personalistic ethic citing the Calvinist-Puritan movements for the development of an ethic concerned with society as a whole.

One notes here a synthesis of Anabaptist form to the ethics (follow Christ, accept Sermon on the Mount and apostolic foundations) with a neo-Calvinist focus and locus in relation to the total community. And a focus which was universal, not tribal; historical, not apocalyptic or heavenly; starting inwardly but stressing the concrete outwardness of corporate life.

In this rejection of subjectivis, millennialism and otherworldliness Rauschenbusch was in line with what Robert Friedmann has shown to be one of the definitive struggles of the Anabaptists and other left-wing groups. As a matter of fact, he argues that pietism sapped the ethical vitality of Anabaptism in less than a hundred years through an emotional, individualistic, inner, subjectivism which had made peace with the status quo of social institutions.[2]

In one of Friedmann's very typical uses of outlines he puts it this way:

Pietism	Anabaptism
1. Experiential Christianity	1. Concrete or existential
2. Experience of one's own sinfulness, conversion, enjoyment of grace and edification	2. Imitation of Christ, discipleship, obedience and martyrdom

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "Die Geschichte der Idee des Reiches," (Rochester, N. Y., 1902) in the Rauschenbusch Scrapbook, pp. 14-15, at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

[2] See "Study I, Anabaptism and Pietism," in his Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries (Goshen: The Mennonite Historical Society, 1949); and his essay, "Anabaptism and Pietism," Mennonite Quarterly Review, Vol. XIV (April and July, 1940).

3.	The "sweet" Christ	3.	The "bitter" Christ
4.	Godliness (Gottseligkeit)	4.	God-fearing (Gottesfurcht)
5.	Group of redeemed individuals turning more to denominational type of church	5.	Closely knit brotherhood with individuals anonymous
6.	Emotionalism	6.	Stern, austere, frame of mind
7.	Peace with the world	7.	Non-conformity[1]

The contrasts brought out by this chart repeat the point pursued more fully in the previous chapter where pietism operates in conflict and affinity with sectarianism. Against the background of the analysis in this chapter it might appear there were no influences from pietism--yet this is not the case despite Rauschenbusch's vigorous rejection of certain basic errors of pietism.

The critics of Rauschenbusch have charged that in refuting these errors he fell into the opposite error where God's transcendence in an unquenchable Kingdom was lost. There are passages which imply this but others suggest an effort to protect himself against this charge. To the present writer it is clear that both aspects are there. But his defenses for God's transcendence were too weak in view of the sharp concessions which he made to immanentism.

The major point, however, is clear: Basically, the Kingdom is located within history as a socio-historical reality struggling with pietism, otherworldliness and apocalypticism.

F. The Ethics of the Kingdom: Love is the Law of Life

1. The origins of love: We can go from the love of God to the love of man; or from the love of man to the love of God

In his Taylor lectures Rauschenbusch declares that "the death of Christ was the supreme revelation of love." Moreover, he seeks to relate the life and death of Jesus:

---

[1] *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, *ibid*.

> If Jesus had died a natural death, posterity would still treasure his teaching, coupled with the commentary of his life, as the most beautiful exposition of love. But its effectiveness was greatly increased by his death. Death has a strange power over the human imagination and memory. A pathetic or heroic death wins a place for a weak and cowardly man. If a significant death is added to a brave and self-sacrificing life, the effect is great. A righteous man might well pray for this as the last great blessing of his life and weld all his labors into one by the flame of suffering. This crowning grace was given to Jesus. His death underscored all he said on love. It put the red seal of sincerity on his words. 'Greater love hath no man than that he give his life for his friends.' Unless he gives it for his enemies, too.[1]

Thus Rauschenbusch joins with the traditional evangelical emphasis on the death of Christ as the supreme revelation of God's love.

He is quite insistent, however, that this center of love in the Cross must issue in ethical activity. To him love to God is inseparable from love to men. He quotes and then comments on the well known passage from I John:

> 'Hereby have we come to a comprehension of love, by the fact that he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our life for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's goods and beholdeth his brother in need, and, shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him?'
>
> This passage shows how swiftly a Christian mind passed from the nature of love as defined by the death of Christ to social action in matters of property relations.[2]

Thus, Christ's bestowed love on us, in gratitude we love our neighbor in concrete patterns of social action.

Nevertheless, Rauschenbusch declares that love may originate from the other direction:

> We assume that love to God must come first and is the proper starting point and foundation for the love of man. Is it not just as much the other way? The love of man is our concrete object lesson in the kindergarten of love, and if we learn that well, and as fast as we learn that well, the love of God grows in us and we become religious. This is Biblical doctrine. 'He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'[3]

Concluding this section of his analysis on the nature of love, he said:

To love men, then, is an avenue to the living experience of God. There

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, pp. 270-271.

[2] Unto Me, op. cit., p. 19. [3] Ibid.

> may be other paths that lead to him, such as the solitary search for truth, or the lonely way of mystic contemplation. But love is the surest way with the fewest pitfalls; the broad way open to all sorts and conditions of men, and the way consecrated by Jesus Christ. We should expect, therefore, that those who are engaged in social work with a really loving spirit will find religion growing in them. . . . We might even look in social work for that most difficult triumph in the breeding of religion, the restoration of conscious religion where it was dead.[1]

This is consistent with his concept that discipleship is not limited to Christians or churchmen in the formal sense. A simple summary would be this sentence from the Taylor lectures: "We love and serve God when we love and serve our fellows, whom he loves and in whom he lives."[2] The difference between the Christian and non-Christian apparently is that the Christian knows the love originates in God and the non-Christian does not know this fact. Ethically they are on the same ground if both are loving and serving the neighbor. Assuming both the Christian and the non-Christian are loving the neighbor, they will soon be on the same ground religiously because of Rauschenbusch's confident belief that love for the neighbor will almost inevitably lead to love for God. Visser t' Hooft charges that this conception makes no distinction between service to God and service to man, hence, leading to serious confusion. Rauschenbusch's answer to this would be that he is giving a radically ethical definition of Christianity, that he is seeking to break all ecclesiastical monopolies on true religion, that he wants God's will to be operative in the whole sweep of human life, that it is desirable but not absolutely necessary to have God's work done by the people who have openly acknowledged God.

Therefore, love may originate in God through Christ and go to the neighbor; or love may originate in loving deeds to the neighbor and then go back to its source in God.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[2] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 48.

2. Love makes society: The Kingdom is the Realm of Love because love is the only true working principle of human society

The Kingdom "implies a progressive reign of love in all human affairs."[1]

"The social gospel is based on the belief that love is the only true working principle of human society."[2]

On the last page of his book dealing with First Corinthians, the thirteenth chapter, Rauschenbusch wrote:

> Those who take up the propaganda of love and substitute freedom and fraternity for coercion and class differences in social life are the pioneers of the Kingdom of God; for reign of the God of love will be fulfilled in a life of humanity organized on the basis of solidarity and love.[3]

Clearly Rauschenbusch assigns a radical role to love in the Kingdom--indeed, an all-encompassing task. The crux of the whole matter to him is the fact that love is the society-creating ingredient. Here are a few short sentences from Unto Me which make this evident:

> Cooperative organizations are a remarkable demonstration of the society making power of love.[4]
>
> We can watch the society-making force of love at work in the creation of new social organizations.[5]
>
> . . . love is the real chemical for amalgamation.[6]
>
> Love is the social instinct, the power of social coherence, the *sine qua non* of human society.[7]
>
> In putting his hand on love as the most essential thing in the Christian life, he laid hold at the same time of the most important thing in all social philosophy. *For if there were no love there would be no sociology.*[8]

Obviously, this makes love the key to sociology. It is the elemental force, the basic ingredient which brings and then binds men together. Social institutions and culture-in-general are the necessary or potential expression of love. Where it is only potential then love steps in to complete its work.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 142. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 273. [3] *Unto Me*, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

[4] *Unto Me*, *op. cit.*, p. 38. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[6] *Ibid.* [7] *Ibid.*, p. 22. [8] *Ibid.*

3. Love relates us to society: The Kingdom is the realm of love because it moves the strong to stand with the weak in an affirmation of the sanctity of life

Rauschenbusch has a strong prophetic feeling that we must emulate Jesus and the prophets and openly identify ourselves with the oppressed and rejected elements of society. "Love alone," he writes, "creates enduring loyalty and persuades the individual to give up something of his own for the common good of society."[1] Out of love a person is moved to sacrifice by identifying with the downtrodden classes of the earth. This identification he finds very clearly in Jesus and is best spelled out in his highly successful little book for college students, The Social Principles of Jesus:

> No one can turn from a frank reading of the gospels without realizing that Jesus had a deep fellow-feeling not only for suffering and handicapped individuals, but for the mass of poorer people of his country, the peasants, the fisherman, the artisans. He declared that it was his mission to bring glad tidings to this class; not only with glad words, but happy realities. Evidently the expectation of the coming Reign of God to his mind signified some substantial relief and release to the submerged and oppressed. Our modern human feeling glories in this side of our Saviour's work.[2]

Out of this sense of solidarity, love comes in to structure this feeling with a positive, explicit identification with the suffering of mankind. This is the basic connection with the poor people at the bottom of society.

There is in this movement toward the weak and the poor a certain delight in the sanctity of life:

> Love and religion have the power of idealistic interpretation. To a mother her child is a wonderful being. To a true lover the girl he loves has sacredness. With Jesus the consciousness of a God of love revealed the beauty of men. The old gods were supermen, mythical duplicates of human kings and conquerors. The God of Jesus was the great Father who let his light shine on the just and the unjust, and offers forgiveness and love to all. Jesus lived in the spiritual atmosphere of that faith. Consequently, he saw men from that point of view. They were to him children of that God. Even the lowliest was high. The light that shone on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 33. [2] P. 38.

> him from the face of God shed a splendor on the prosaic ranks of men. In this way religion enriches and illuminates social feeling.[1]

Solidarity-identification-sanctity of life--all these are part of loves work as it relates itself to society.

Rauschenbusch climaxes this trend of thought with an interesting conception of the *epistemology* of love. According to his view, we must love people in order to understand them:

> Love is the greatest educator, the most permanent stimulus of the intellectual life. . . . A selfish person becomes a stupid person if he lives long enough. Other things being equal, the loving people are the wise people.[2]

Love makes society as the creative force which binds men into communal groups. Love relates itself to society through solidaristic identification of the strong with the weak. Love is guided in this identification through its own epistemology of illumination.

4. The immediate task of love: To become socialized through the Christianization of the economic order

In his commentary on First Corinthians, chapter thirteen, he asks a number of crucial questions:

Must we permanently live in a loveless industrial world, or do we dare to be Christians?[3]

Have we faith enough to believe that the Christian doctrine of love is the solution of our big modern questions?[4]

Do we dare assert the futility of everything in our great world of commerce and industry that leaves love out?[5]

Do we dare to undertake the readjustment of all social life to bring it into obedience to the law of love?[6]

---

[1] *The Social Principles of Jesus*, p. 9. [2] *Unto Me*, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

[3] *Dare We Be Christians?*, *op. cit.*, p. 43. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[5] *Ibid.* [6] *Ibid.*

He then goes on to outline the work of love as follows:

> The severest test and the most urgent task of love today is in the field of business life. Unless love can dominate the making of wealth the wealth of our nation will be the ferment of its decay. There will be no genuine advance for human society until business experiences the impulse, the joy, the mental fertility of free teamwork. As long as industry is built on fundamental antagonisms and the axle of every wheel is hot with smothered resentment, there can be no reign of love and no new era of civilization. Our age is asking leaders of the business world to take a great constructive forward step and to found business on organized love.[1]

Business to be founded on organized love!

Lest one might think Rauschenbusch has lost all contact with reality, he presents a strikingly realistic analysis of just what this hope is struggling against. The following passage is an outstanding example of the union of stark realism and radical idealism which came together in his outlook:

> With true Christian instinct men have turned to the Christian law of love as the key to the situation. If we all loved our neighbor, we shoud 'treat him right,' pay him a living wage, give sixteen ounces to the pound, and not charge so much for beef. But this appeal assumes that we are still living in the simple personal relations of the good old times, and that every man can do the right thing when he wants to do it. But suppose a business man should be glad indeed to pay his young women the $12 a week which they need for a decent living, but all his competitors are paying from $7 down to $5. Shall he love himself into bankruptcy? In a time of industrial depression shall he employ men whom he does not need? And if he does, will his five loaves feed the five thousand unemployed that break his heart with their hungry eyes? If a man owns a hundred shares of stock in a great corporation, how can his love influence its wage scale with that puny stick? *The old advice of love breaks down before the hugeness of modern relations*. We might as well try to start a stranded ocean liner with the oar which poled our old dory from the mud banks many a time. *It is indeed love that we want but it is socialized love*. Blessed be the love that holds the cup of water to thirsty lips. We can never do without plain affection of man to man. But what we most need today is not the love that will break its back drawing water for a growing factory town from a well that was meant to supply a village, but a love so large and intelligent that it will persuade an ignorant people to build a system of waterworks up in the hills, and that will get after the thoughtless farmers who contaminate the brooks with typhoid bacilli, and after the lumber concern that is denuding the watershed of its forests. *We want a new avatar of love*.[2]

Thus a socialized love emerges. It is essentially a love which understands the causation in social institutions, particularly economic, of human misery. The older love is outmoded not because it is love; but because it is only personal and individualistic. In other words, the sociology but not the ethics of love need alteration.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 44. [2] *Christianizing the Social Order*, pp. 43-44.

5. Love relates itself to other ethical principles: Justice is a minimal pre-condition of love. Love and justice are needed to restore right relations when injustice occurs

This aspect of Rauschenbusch's thought is difficult to set forth because part of his analysis is ambiguous. During his career the leading social thinkers did not sharply distinguish between love and justice. This is pre-Nygren and pre-Niebuhr.

To be consistent with the documentation for his concept of love in previous pages, we are forced to say that love is the controlling, dominant, primary ethical emphasis in his system of thought. Yet there are references to justice. At times they appear to be unrelated to previous discussions of love. At other times he does relate them. Perhaps it would clear the air at the outset to declare that, to Rauschenbusch, there is no inherent conflict between love and justice. It would be more accurate to say that he does see grave tension between love and injustice. Niebuhr has stressed that justice *qua* justice is in tension with love *qua* love. Rauschenbusch, on the other hand, stresses that injustice "sterilizes" love.[1] Injustice destroys the solidaristic unity among humanity and, when this takes place, love breaks down.

By the same token, love seems to have the primary role in awakening us to destroy injustice. In a sense, love is the precondition of justice. The following passages confirm what has been said at this point:

> Thus love is the society-making force. Social progress depends on the available supply of love. If the sense of solidarity is so strong that in-

---

[1] *Dare We Be Christians*, p. 40.

> justice and oppression are intolerable to all and the creation of new fraternal relations is swift and easy, then society can efficiently meet every new strain.
>
> If the Church looks on injustice without holy anger it allows the institution of redemptive love to give shelter to lovelessness, and is itself involved in the charge of hypocrisy.[1]

The argument, then, seems to be that love creates solidarity and solidarity makes injustice intolerable. If the church tolerates injustice it is betrayed into a hypocritical lovelessness. Apparently, injustice may be defined as lovelessness, which is to say, injustice is the absence of love.

Granted the dangerous character of injustice and granted that love is the crucial agent in making us sensitive to injustice, what do we do when injustice has taken place? The answer comes at two levels: personal and social. The following passage suggests his approach:

> Until injustice between individuals is made right by restoration or forgiveness, fraternity between them is cleft, and only heroic love on the part of the wronged can bridge the gap. For a man who has overreached or wronged his neighbor, to offer him favors or charity is felt to add insult to injury. If he loves him, let him love him enough to be just to him.[2]

This appears to say: First, justice must be done. This may be restoring some property or a change of attitude in terms of forgiveness. Second, love must bridge the gap and it may never be less than justice but obviously it ought to be more than justice.

As for social groups, the courts are necessary and large-scale changes are needed such as adequate taxation of land values and other basic structural changes. At this point it is difficult to discover how love functions in these more far-reaching social changes.

In any case, love was first seen as the precondition of justice. In Rauschenbusch it is also true that justice is the mimimal basis of love.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[2] *Christianizing the Social Order*, p. 332.

1. Love and justice are in a dialectical relationship with love as the precondition of justice and justice as the minimal basis of love.

2. Love is the basic all-important reality with the negative role of abolishing injustice and the positive role of expressing itself in the major social institutions.

3. Love and justice are synonyms both meaning a society-creating righteousness.

4. He is inconsistent: In Dare We Be Christians? love is the all-important ethical reality. (It was written in 1914, after Christianity and the Social Crisis, 1907; and Christianizing the Social Order, 1912. This was three years before his Yale lectures, "A Theology for the Social Gospel," 1917.) In Christianizing the Social Order first love and then justice are the key ethical concepts:

> With true Christian instinct men have turned to the Christian law of love as the key to the situation. . . . It is indeed love that we want but socialized love.[1]
>
> The simplest and most fundamental quality needed in the moral relations of men is justice.[2]

On the face of it, this appears to be a bald contradiction. And so it is. But this isn't the dominant pattern. The dominant pattern is love as the all-important reality with the negative role of abolishing injustice because injustice destroys solidarity; and the positive role of expressing itself in major social institutions. The other two patterns are also present, namely, love and justice as synonymous and as dialectically related. But they are not used as frequently as the first.

6. Coercion is the symbol of the failure of love

This point is clearly established in Dare We Be Christians?:

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, pp. 43-44.

[2] Ibid., p. 332.

> The frequency with which our communities have to fall back on physical coercion is a symptom of the failure of love, for love can usually dispense with force. The more love, the less force; the more force, the less love. Despotic government had to use plentiful force to keep its unnatural structure erect. The spread of democracy has brought a great softening of the horrors of criminal law and it will yet bring us a great lessening of militarism. Every proposed increase in police force and military organization is a challenge and accusation against those institutions of society which ought to create social solidarity. If ever our country draws toward its ruin, it will bristle with efficient arsenals and hired fighters. The constant use of military violence in labor disputes in our country proves that industry is still in the despotic state. It needs democratizing and Christianizing.[1]

While recognizing the frequency with which love collapses into coercion, this statement clearly assumes that love is both desirable and possible. Physical coercion is not inherent in the social fabric. It is a temporary, pathological development which love _must_ drive out because love _can_ drive it out. Pacifism is therefore a potential factor.

The development of Rauschenbusch's thought with regard to war and social coercion can be documented through D. R. Sharpe.[2]

In the first phase, he saw the value of various American wars in stepping up social change, in releasing new and creative tendencies in American life and, generally, in promoting freedom.

The second phase came during the first World War when he faced ruthless anti-German hysteria with a proposal roughly equivalent to the pre-World War II neutrality act which banned the sale of munitions.[3]

The third phase came when he officially joined the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a Christian pacifist organization. He delivered a major address to the F. O. R. in Boston, March 10, 1917, which Vida Scudder declared to be the best analysis of the ethical problem of war she had heard.

To be sure there is his letter to Cornelius Woelfkin of May 1, 1918, shortly before his death, which creates some confusion.

---

[1] _Dare We Be Christians_, pp. 43-44. [2] Sharpe, _op. cit._, pp. 356-392.

[3] Stephen Rauschenbusch, the son of Walter Rauschenbusch, was the chief investigator for the Nye Munitions Investigating Committee of the U. S. Senate.

His Boston F. O. R. address, however, seems to be his clearest and his final word on the subject. It contained the following emphases:

1. War should be set amid other social evils all of them closely connected in their roots.

2. Love is the supremem principle making reconciliation a present duty.

3. Jesus and war are in utter conflict.[1]

As for coercion in the social struggle, he maintained a pragmatic pacifism. This was in the period prior to his joining the F. O. R., when he said:

> I do not say that force is never to be used. It is certainly useful as a rod to hang on the wall, and there are bad boys in these United States more alive to the swish of the rod than to all moral suasion. I am contending only that force is not as effective as it looks. . . . The slow conflict of opposing forces is God's method of educating a nation.[2]

He also pointed out that the ruling classes can play the game of violence better than the working classes. Hence, an additional prudential argument along with the religious and moral emphasis on love which he always made.

Always his approach emphasized the necessity of basic structural changes. Hence, his fine line: "The idea that violence can suddenly establish righteousness is just as utopian as the idea that moral suasian can suddenly establish it."[3]

Perhaps his unique combination of a love ethic plus social realism is seen in this passage from his essay on, "Belated Races and the Social Problem,":

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 380-381.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Ideals of Social Reformers," American Journal of Sociology, II (Sept., 1896), 216. The interpretation of this passage as pragmatic pacifism is based on his argument that force is not effective

[3] Walter Rauschenbusch, ibid, II (Sept., 1896), 216.

> There is some historical justification for the charge of Nietzsche that Christianity has taught the servile virtues of patience and submission. I believe in gentleness and meekness, not in servility. I have no faith in force methods and even believe in non-resistance, but not in the non-resistance of cowardice and silence. There was nothing cringing in Jesus. He did not strike back but neither did he flinch. He was the 'terrible meek.'[1]

By way of summary, Rauschenbusch understands love in the following manner:

1. The origins of love: we can go from the love of God to the love of man; or from the love of man to the love of God.

2. Love makes society: The Kingdom is the realm of love because love is the only true working principle of human society.

3. Love relates us to society: The Kingdom is the realm of love because it moves the strong to stand with the weak in an affirmation of the sanctity of life.

4. The immediate task of love: To become socialized through the Christianization of the economic order.

5. Love relates itself to ethical principles: Justice is a minimal precondition of love. Love and justice are needed to restore right relations when injustice occurs.

6. Coercion is the symbol of the failure of love.

In seeking for the origins of these concepts of love, the Protestant left-wing again comes into the picture. Unfortunately, the two books which he wrote most directly on love were small and wholly without footnotes, a most unusual thing in his otherwise highly documented writings. Unto Me is his book on social work. It contains a long section on the meaning of love but has no references to any books or writers. Dare We Be Christians? is based on First Corinthians, chapter thirteen; hence, it has many references to Biblical material. Of non-Biblical writers quoted in Dare We Be Christians? only Tolstoy is mentioned. That Rauschenbusch is deeply indebted to Tolstoy has been mentioned previously in this study.[1]

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Belated Races and the Social Problem," Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Scrapbook, III, 30; part of an address to the American Missionary Association.

Rauschenbusch was immersed in the scriptures, particularly in the synoptic gospels seen through the eyes of late nineteenth-century critical apparatus and by-passing the Weiss-Schweitzer upheaval. His desire to remain in the spirit and the essence of the synoptic gospels would, of course, contribute to his emphasis on love.

His studies in the Continental Anabaptists, once again, bring the emphasis of love and the rejection of violence. As always he has a sense of historical perspective:

> We understand their refusal to bear arms and their opposition to war when we remember that Germany contained two-thousand little potentates with the right to make war on one another; that war was largely brigandage by the princes on a large scale, and that the Swiss cantons hired out their young men as mercenaries to anyone who paid. And were they not prophetic of a day beyond our own in condemning the brutal game of killing?[2]

In the letter of Conrad Grebel to Thomas Muenzer which he translated and interpreted he wrote:

> Grebel and his friends regard nonresistance as the unquestionable Christian duty against oppression and persecution. They feel trouble impending. They face the thought of suffering and death with a spiritual exaltation that thrills. They are the little flock among wolves and must suffer in meekness. Here they clash with Muenzer. He was the angry voice of the new coming social democracy, and his religion only served to make him angrier and bolder. They, on the other hand, utter the thought of the gospel and of the medieval sects.[3]

All of Rauschenbusch's major books have references to St. Francis of Assisi. In Christianizing the Social Order he remarks in a footnote that

---

[1] See pp. 121-122 for the reference to Tolstoy.

[2] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, op. cit.

[3] American Journal of Theology, IX (Jan.,1905), p. 91.

"Sabatier's 'Life of St. Francis' is still the classical interpretation of that wonderful soul."[1] The following in Sabatier's book enter into Rauschenbusch's conception of love:

1. The conception of the apostolate, originally quite primitive and without hierarchy (See Chapter V, "The First Year of the Apostolate.")
2. The radical emphasis on love: From God and to the neighbor
3. The emphasis on enduring suffering
4. The renunciation of property and the embrace of Lady Poverty
5. The tragic struggle with institutional Christianity

One strophe from The Canticle of the Sun (1225) conveys something of the apostolic and evangelical quality of love which might have influenced Rauschenbusch: "Praised be my Lord for all those who pardon one another for his love's sake, and who endure weakness and tribulation; blessed are they who peaceably shall endure, for thou, O most highest, shall give them a crown."[2]

The following are the concrete sectarian influences which helped to make love the central foundation of his religious and ethical outlook:

The interpretation of the synoptic gospels, especially the Sermon on the Mount and Paul's love chapter, as essentially ethical

Tolstoy, the Russian sectarian who based his whole system on the Sermon on the Mount extricated from the remainder of the Bible

Anabaptists with a radical doctrine of nonresistance

St. Francis, the pre-Reformation sectarian with his radical love ethic in a Roman context

On the other hand, we shall have to study his relationship to liberalism to find the sources for his sociological concept of love, making it the basic element in human society as a whole.

---

[1] P. 84.

[2] Paul Sabatier, Life of St. Francis of Assisi (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), p. 306. Chapter XVIII is devoted to the Canticle of the Sun with both Latin and English texts along with critical comments.

It is not difficult to show that Rauschenbusch was essentially correct in connecting love and nonresistance with sectarianism. Troeltsch, for example, in his summary of sect characteristics notes the following:

> Lay Christianity, personal achievement in ethics and religion, the radical fellowship of love, religious equality and brotherly love, indifference toward the authority of the State and the ruling classes, dislike of technical law and of the oath, the separation of the religious life from the economic struggle by means of the ideal of poverty and frugality, or occasionally in a charity which becomes communism, the directness of the personal religious relationship, criticism of official spiritual guides and theologians, the appeal to the New Testament and to the Primitive Church.[1]

Roland Bainton points out that the left-wing groups had a Christian primitivism which declared that the church must be patterned after the primitive church, hence, back to Jesus.[2] The "fall" of the church is correlated with Constantine when he militarized, brutalized and politicalized the early Christian fellowship. The Lutheran's dated the fall with Boniface III in the seventh century when the Papacy put its fingers into the pie of temporal power. Anglican fall is the Fourth Ecumenical council when true catholicity was qualified. In returning to Jesus and to the apostolic church, the sectarians returned to love.

Dean H. S. Bender in his "Anabaptist Vision" said that "the third great element in the Anabaptist vision was the ethic of love and nonresistance applied to all human relationships."[3]

In trying to assess the vulnerability of Rauschenbusch's concept of love to current criticism, one must bear in mind that the rich agape studies of Nygren, Warnach, Stauffer and De Rougemont were not available to him. This lessened the sharpness with which he approached the definition of love. By the same token, Reinhold Niebuhr's studies in the egocentric and prudential aspects of justice were not available to Rauschenbusch. This lack also tended to dissolve some of the real tension which exists between the love and justice.

---

[1] Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), I, p. 336.

[2] Bainton, op. cit., pp. 120-127. [3] Bender, op. cit., p. 21.

There are passages like the following suggesting that he understood the sacrificial character of agape even though this motif is usually submerged under the solidaristic emphasis:

> Christianity means love. Love means community of interests and solidarity of life. The family has always been used as a symbol of Christian relations because it is the social organization most completely based on love and exhibiting the completest community life and possessions. Hence, we speak of God as our father and men as our brothers. Now it should be the aim of Christianity to base all other human relations on the same fundamental principles on which the family is based. The family contains the utmost diversity of sex, age, ability, and education, yet it exhibits complete social equality among its members. It recognizes authority but the authority is unselfish and sacrificial authority. The family is organized on the basis of service and not exploitation.[1]

With this general statement on the sacrificial character of familistic love, Rauschenbusch then illustrates agape in the family and compares it with economic ethics:

> The baby is not compelled to work the longest hours and take the smallest wage because it is weak and unable to organize a babies trade union. The father does not seize the larger part of the turkey and call it profit. Therefore, our homes are havens of our rest and the most Christianizing and the most educative institutions we have. I hold that a nation will be Christian in the measure in which it regards itself as a great family and thus treats its members on the basis of social equality, solidarity of interests and possessions, and mutual service. It is not Christian to exclude large classes of the nation from any share in the ownership of the productive plant of the nation and of its soil. It is not Christian to pay least to the man who has the hungriest family.[2]

This quotation clearly shows that he perceived the sacrificial character of love and yet that he demanded the fullest expression of this in the whole social situation.

Visser t' Hooft views this as the universalization of the ethics of family life. Indeed, in Christianity and the Social Crisis, Rauschenbusch says, "Instead of the policeman theory, a family theory of the state should be adopted."[1] Visser 't Hooft then makes this comment on what this really does to the love ethic:

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "What is a Christian Nation?," Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Scrapbook, Vol. II.

[2] Ibid.

> Extension rather than intensity or depth of love becomes the criterion; the quantitative aspect becomes of greater importance than the qualitative. In fact love has to be toned down for its expansion to the ends of the earth. It is then simply identified with the cooperative qualities or with a general sentiment of goodwill rather than the qualities ascribed to it in the gospel. No idealist is so idealistic as to propose that love in the exact sense in which it is used in the gospels shall be made the immediate guide for society as it exists today. If, therefore, it is still looked upon as one of the social principles on which society should be built, compromise becomes inevitable and love is understood to mean something much less exacting and revolutionary.[2]

Surely in Rauschenbusch we have one of the boldest attempts in Christian social thought to construct a political and social ethic in terms of love. The criticism of Visser 't Hooft is typical of the line of attack on this approach. In any case, the opening chapter revealed that he set the pace and framed the issues for the years just before and after World War I.

7. The Sociology of the Kingdom: Life operates in a solidaristic, socio-organic context in which sin expresses itself in super-personal social institutions bound together in the Kingdom of Evil. This kingdom is to be countered with the Kingdom of God which must deal with social groups in its pattern of salvation

Already we have seen that Rauschenbusch had a Kingdom ethics stressing the primacy of love. Thus, on this crucial issue he had a sectarian dimension to his thought.

Rauschenbusch has a realistic sociology with a solidaristic doctrine of institutions. It is at this point that his doctrine of sin is spelled out in the Kingdom of Evil concept through a re-working or the doctrine of original sin:

---

[1] P. 399. [2] Visser 't Hooft, op. cit., p. 53.

1. Evil is transmitted both socially and biologically.

2. The evil of one generation is caused by the evil of the generation which preceeded it.

3. Sin and evil are wrought into social institutions which become super-personal forces imposing their sinfulness upon the individuals related to them.

4. These institutions are a form of collective selfishness perpetuated by the profitable quality of evil.

5. Although past generations are represented in the collectivity of evil, the sources of evil are now present and active.

6. The all-pervasive character of the Kingdom of Evil makes it impossible to deal with through any purely individualistic answer.

7. The evil which has beset the network of social institution is not inherent in these institutions, hence, radical social change is both desirable and possible.[1]

Contrariwise, the doctrine of salvation must incorporate the sociology of the Kingdom of God as the doctrine of sin incorporates the Kingdom of Evil.

1. Personal salvation is still important but the social gospel starts where the personal experience leaves off. He asks the reader "to take all the familiar experiences and truths of personal evangelism and religious nurture for granted in what follows. But our understanding of personal salvation itself is deeply affected by the new solidaristic comprehension furnished by the social gospel."[2]

2. For the full redemption of the individual there must be salvation of the super-personal forces of society: "For beyond the feeble and short-lived individual towers the social group as a super-personal entity, dominating

---

[1] Rauschenbusch's A Theology for the Social Gospel develops his sociology most completely, especially Chapter VIII, "The Super-Personal Forces of Evil," and Chapter XI, "The Salvation of the Super-Personal Forces."

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

the individual, assimilating him to its moral standards, and enforcing them by the social sanctions of approval or disapproval."[1]

3. With these composite social personalities or institutions "the love of money is the root of all evil." The Rochester social prophet view this issue as follows:

> Communities and nations fall into wild fits of anger and cruelty; they are vain and contemptuous of others; they lie and love lies; they sin against their critical conscience; they fall in love with virile and magnetic men just as women do. These are temptations and dangers which every democracy will meet and from which it will recover with loss and some shame. But, as has been said before, evils become bold and permanent when there is money in them. It was the need of protecting wealth against poverty which made the courts and the criminal law so cruel in the past. It was theological superstition which started the epidemic of witch trials in Europe, but it was the large fees that fell to the lawyers and informers which made that craze so enduring. Nearly all modern wars have had their origin in the covetousness of trade and finance.[2]

From all this Rauschenbusch draws the conclusion which is basic to his whole system:

> If unearned gain is the chief corrupter of professions, institutions, and combinations of men, these super-personal beings will be put on the road to salvation when their graft is in some way cut off and they are compelled to subsist on the reward of honest service.[3]

4. The Church is the social factor in salvation because it is a super-personal institution; as such it must be expressive of the living Christ.

He asks a challenging question:

> What, then, might a super-personal being do which would be organized around Jesus Christ as its impelling power, and would have for its sole or chief object to embody his spirit in its life and to carry him into human thought and the conduct of affairs.[4]

This is a vision of the church whose role is embody the Kingdom of God and bring the super-personal forces under the law of Christ.

In seeing the corporateness of the church, he expresses his characteristic contempt for a purely non-institutional and non-social approach. "What

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 110. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

[3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.

chance," he asks, "*would a disembodied spirit of Christianity have, whispering occasionally at the key-hole of the human heart?*"[1] This leads him to conclude that "nothing lasts unless it is organized, and if it is organized of human life, we must put up with the qualities of human life in it."[2]

Thus, we have seen the sociology of Rauschenbusch. On the positive side it is a sociology of love since love makes and creates solidarity. Functionally it is a sociology of institutions stressing the decisive role of super-personal forces expressed in social organization.

Rauschenbusch traces the heart of his sociology to the sects, both pre-Reformation and Reformation as well as to some larger currents in the mainstream of the sixteenth-century upheaval. The ideal of "the poverty of the church" he finds particularly rooted in the sects. In regard to the role of money in the Reformation he interprets this in relation to Luther and the major Reformers. The crucial passage follows:

> It was this profit system in the Church which produced the religious unrest and finally the revolutionary upheaval of the Reformation in some nations. Men were not dissatisfied with the doctrines of the Church. There were surprisingly few theological heretics. Wycliffe and his followers are the only ones that gained popular influence, and his chief interest, too, was in the social utilization of the wealth of the church. Men like Savonarola were not doctrinal reformers, but were trying to cleanse the Church of its graft and the resulting idleness and vice. *The ideal of 'the poverty of the Church' which was common to men so unlike Saint Bernard, Arnold of Bresica, Saint Francis and all the democratic sects*, must be understood over against the vested wealth, the graft, and semi-governmental power of the church. They wanted the Church voluntarily to give up its wealth, and to put its ministers on the basis of service and the daily bread.[3] (Italics Mine)

As far as the mainstream of the Reformation is concerned, property was again a key issue:

> The Church refused to take this heroic path of repentance of its own free will. So it was compelled to take it. In all the countries which officially adopted the Reformation, the possessions and vested incomes of the Church were secularized. The sinecures mostly disappeared. The bishops lost their governmental functions. Everywhere the reform movements converged on this improverishment of the Church with a kind of collective

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 120. [2] *Ibid*. [3] *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 116.

> instinct. Luther's theses on indulgences got their popularity not their new and daring theology, for they were a hesitating and wavering statement of a groping mind--but by the fact that they touched one of the chief sources of papal income. Several of the great doctrines of the Reformation got their vitality by their internal connection with the question of church property.[1]

These two quotations reveal that Rauschenbusch found his sociology of institutions rooted in both the sectarians and the main parties of the Reformation. Moreover, he emphasizes the crucial factor of money in relation to ecclesiastical institutions and doctrines.

This is not to say that he saw the sectarians and major Reformers in the same class while Rauschenbusch considered both influenced by socio-economic factors, the sectarians reflected the proletarian classes and the Reformers the middle classes.

In 1893 at the meeting of the Baptist Congress in Augusta, Georgia, Rauschenbusch read a paper upon the subject, "The Church and the Money Power."

In this paper he suggested that someday a church historian should throw aside the traditions of his profession inherited from papal and monarchial days and write a history on the simple but profound principle: Ubi spiritus Christi, ibi ecclesia--where the spirit of Christ is, there is the church. On this possibility he comments:

> He will probably find the bulk of Christian history in the history of the heretical movements, and he will also show how much social leaven was contained in all the reformatory movements of the church. I need only mention the Waldenses, Savanarola, Wiclif, the Bohemian Brethren, the mendicant orders, the Quakers, the Anabaptists and the Mennonites.[2]

Then he goes on to analyze the Reformation from the class perspective:

> The population of Germany took sides largely according to social standing. The princes and the great nobles stood firm by the Catholic Church; religiously and socially they stood by things as they were. The lower

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Church and Money Power," The Proceedings of the Baptist Congress, 1893, pp. 10-17; quoted in A Rauschenbusch Sourcebook with Commentary by Conrad Henry Moehlman (Los Angeles, 1953), p. 51.

> nobility and the burghers of the cities adopted the Reformation of the Wittenberg and Swiss Reformers; it was a middle class movement; and in most cities where the new doctrine carried the day the political situation was simultaneously revolutionized. It overthrew the monopoly of civil power held by the Catholic princes and nobility and carried into power the Lutheran or Reformed burghers.[1]

Rauschenbusch then reveals the role of the Anabaptists:

> Anabaptist doctrine finally took hold of the proletarian masses, the rabble of the cities and the peasants of the country. It was the revolutionary kind of doctrine, brimful of social applications of Christianity. That Catholics and Lutherans united in crushing out the Anabaptist is by no means solely due to theological convictions, but to class interests aroused to fury. The middle class began to come into its inheritance at the Reformation, in religion, politics and social enfranchisement. The lower classes have had to wait till our own generation; they have now achieved their political rights; slowly they are also achieving their social rights; and in so far as Christianity is really sharing in the people's movement, it is recalling the church to its ancient hostility to money power.[2]

Rauschenbusch apparently views the Catholics as rooted in the upper classes, the Lutherans and the Calvinists rooted in the middle classes and the Anabaptists rooted in the lower classes. Since this proletarian movement was crushed the social gospel and the rise of the labor, socialist and cooperative movements are seen as the final rise of the working classes with the aid of the new religious movement of the social gospel.

Clearly, then, Rauschenbusch had a doctrine of social institutions, a sociology of the Kingdom. It had definite sectarian roots. But the precise form of his sociology is rooted in various liberal theologians as we shall see in the chapter on Rauschenbusch as liberal.

Current Anabaptist scholarship can deal more precisely with the class composition of the left-wing than could Rauschenbusch. Friedrich Engels in 1850 published his study of the Peasants War, making the Anabaptists part of this struggle. Subsequent studies of the economic and social backgrounds of the Anabaptists were utilized in the Zurich doctoral dissertation, _Die Soziale Herkunft der Schweizerischen Taufer 1525-1540_, by Paul Peachey, an American.

---

[1] _Ibid_. [2] _Ibid_., p. 51.

In this study, Peachey concludes:

> Out of the academic and theological milieu in which the Anabaptist concept arose, the movement passes first through the fourgeois classes, then quickly to the peasantry, and with the rise of persecution, in the course of a few years becomes a purely rural phenomenon.
>
> It is very clear that while in a larger way the Reformation, the Peasants' Revolt and Anabaptism all shared in the deep undercurrent of social, political and religious stirrings of the early sixteenth century, actually Anabaptism did not spread among the Swiss peasantry until months and in cases years after the peasant uprising.[1]

Peachy stresses that the really radical factor in the Anabaptist sociology was the rejection of the medieval corpus Christianum, retained by the Reformers. But the over-all impact of his study is to sharpen rather than wholly destroy Rauschenbusch's conception of the Anabaptists as being related to weighty social issues with deep roots in the lower classes.

Rauschenbusch's sociology came as a needed corrective to the subjectivism and individualism of American pietism. In fact, it was one of his outstanding contributions. The identification with the sectarians provides part of the material for his sociology. This is clearly seen in his burning conviction that the sectarians, preceeded by the Franciscan type of monastics, purged the church of the curse of money in its ideal of churchly poverty. The fact that Rauschenbusch was a church historian who was constructing an ethical system is significant because he had a more sensitive outlook toward the past economic corruption of the church. He also drew heavily on his conviction that the Anabaptists aroused the lower classes with a revolutionary kind of social fervor. This Protestant proletarianism was then crushed by the middle class Reformers and the upper class Catholics. On the other hand, his sociology is obviously one of these developments where much of the content is provided by liberal thought--a fact to be developed in the next chapter. But the substantial preparation and formation of his sociology in sectarian terms cannot be denied.

---

[1] Paul Peachey, "Social Background and Social Philosophy of the Swiss Anabaptists," Mennonite Quarterly Review, XXVIII, 105, 113.

Criticisms can be offered. For one thing he did not have the psychological insight which currently is offering so many clues to social behaviour. And, he overstated the case for the economic factor in social life. This was an understandable over-correction during a time when this had been underestimated.

8. The ecclesiology of the Kingdom: The true church is a disciplined, democratic, voluntary association which has a direct effect on social institutions; in making this impact the church realizes its sole reason for existence, namely, to serve the Kingdom

In his Yale lectures Rauschenbusch has a statement which suggest the nature of his doctrine of the church:

> The men who stand for the social gospel have been among the most active critics of the churches because they have realized most clearly both the great needs of our social life and the potential capacities of the Church to meet them. Their criticism has been a form of compliment to the Church. I think they may yet turn out to be the apologists whom the Church most needs at present. They are best fitted to see that while the Church influences society, society has always influenced the Church, and that the Church when it has dropped to the level of its environment, has simply yielded to the law of social gravitation.[1]

This is a picture of mutual interpenetration of the church and society--and this is basic in Rauschenbusch's thought.

He discovers a new emphasis on the church. This is not due to a renascent Anglican Catholicism but to "a combination of purified Protestantism and modern social insight." Much of this purification of Protestantism he ascribes to the liberal theologians of Germany and America. In any case, the net effect of this is to overcome the individualism of Protestant theology which has had an evil effect for many years.

Nowhere does Rauschenbusch set forth a sectarian conception of the church more clearly than his series of essays, "Why I Am a Baptist" of

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

1905-1906. He is humble about his Baptist connections. He declares that he does not want to foster Baptist self-conceit, because thereby he would grieve the spirit of Christ. Nor does he want Baptists to shut themselves up in their little clam-shells and be indifferent to the ocean outside of them. He admits that Baptist church organization is faulty in many ways, that it creaks and groans as it works along, but that it is built on very noble Christian lines; hence, is very dear to him. He is a Baptist but more than a Baptist: "All things are mine, whether Francis of Assisi, or Luther, or Knox, or Wesley; all are mine because I am Christ's. The old Adam is a strict denominationalist; the new Adam is just a Christian."[1]

Then he outlines the pattern for the church through his Baptist orientation:

First, it tries to create an organization of really Christian people. This takes place through discipline and definite standards of moral and spiritual achievement. "It admits to membership," he declares, "only those who deliberately apply for it and who can assert they have met Christ and love him and want to follow him."[2] This is a voluntary association for those that seek it. But it is not formless; it has definite standards which are enforced by discipline.

Second, our churches are Christian democracies. The people are sovereign. The power of the Church is carried out by ministers and officers strictly in the name of the people. All aptitude for leadership is encouraged but this must serve the people and must be reviewed by the people in the chruch from time to time. This democracy has both religious and cultural roots. Religiously, it corresponds to primitive Christianity and to the great wave of popular democracy in England, thus permitting the Baptists to embody and perpetuate the democratic ideals of the Puritan revolution. It has cultural roots in the village communities of the Teutonic ancestor, the communities where many of our popular liberties originated.

---

[1] "Why I Am a Baptist," op. cit., p. 24. [2] Ibid., p. 11.

As over against this lineage, there is the benevolent despotism of the Roman church, emulating the despotism of ancient Rome. And there is the rule by bishops in England which became a prop against Puritan democracy.

Thus the Christian democracy of the Baptist churches--and ideally for all churches--effects the culture and vice versa. Not to have this democracy in the church is to reflect reactionary origins and, in turn, to perpetuate these anti-democratic origins.

Third, the Baptist churches recognize no priestly class. The minister is not essentially different from the laity. There should not be a sharp line between minister and laity but there should by a sharp line between the church and the world. On the other hand, many churches make a sharp line between minister and laity but none between the church and culture. Basically, priests are an inheritance from heathenism and should be avoided because Jesus was not a priest or a creator of priests.

Fourth, there is no hierarchy within the ministery; there is no hierarchy of vicar, rector, bishop, archbishop and pope. To be sure there are inequalities of natural gifts and spiritual insights. But there must be genuine brotherly equality in the ministry.

Fifth, the churches have home rule. Each church is sovereign in its own affairs. This follows the same principle on which our country is built up. It is a principle which does not hinder one from joining larger associations, societies, and conventions.

Finally, the Baptist decline all alliances with the state. At this point, however, he wants to make it clear that he rejects the view of some Baptists that the spiritual life has nothing to do with the secular life. He denies this assertation and considers it calamitous heresy. Separation means the state will not dictate to the church on spiritual affairs; that it will not hamper the work of the church. And, that the church will not introduce ecclesiastically base considerations into politics. His precise formula, given elsewhere,[1] is that there must be a division between church and state in organization but an interpenetration of life between the church and state.

This concludes his outline of his Baptist doctrine of the church presented not as a narrowly partisan view but one which he cherishes for Christianity as a whole. The church emerges as a disciplined, democratic, voluntary association.

The second part of his doctrine of the church is already implied in some of the foregoing material, namely, that the church has a very real effect on social institutions. The previous outline of the church as a democratic, voluntary association included a point on the church as a Christian democracy. Here he showed that this Christian, democratic church was influenced by its origins in primitive Christianity and the Puritan revolution and Teutonic culture. At the same time, this kind of church moulds, shapes and influences the culture in the direction of democracy. Thus the church influences society and society influences the church--this may be for evil purposes of interpenetration or it may be for the loftiest Kingdom-democratic purposes.

The form of church organization is of the utmost importance for the social institutions of the culture. The church is not static; it is dynamic, forever re-creating itself in the culture. In his first great book he makes this point very forcibly:

> A given spirit will create an institution adapted to itself; but in turn an institution will constantly evoke the spirit that fits it. The Catholic Church by its organization tends to keep alive and active the despotic spirit of decadent Roman civilization in which it originated.

---

[1] "The Relation of Church and State," Proceedings of the Baptist Congress, 1899, pp. 138-140; quoted in A Rauschenbusch Sourcebook With Commentary by C. H. Moehlman, pp. 39-43.

> The causal influences running back and forth between civil and ecclesiastical organization of the people are far more powerful than is generally understood. The monarchial government of the Roman church originated in the despotic society of ancient Rome and then perpetuated itself by the conservativism of hallowed religious institutions. The aristocratic republicanism of the Calvinistic churches originated in the Swiss republics and then perpetuated itself wherever Calvinism went. The democracy of the Congregational church bodies originated in the democratic passions of the English Revolution and also perpetuated itself. Thus the church borrows from the state.
>
> But in the same manner the State borrows from the Church. 'The action of religion on the minds of men is so profound that they are always led to give to the organization of the State forms which they have borrowed from that of religion.' If a people is accustomed to the spirit and practice of self-government in its local churches, it will find self-government in the civil community that much easier, and any government from above will be unpalatable.[1]

And now for the final generalization on this creative conception of the relation of the church to its culture:

> Thus it seems likely that if the Christian churches had remained democratic and self-governing organizations, the spirit of Christian democracy would have been perpetuated, intensified, and practically trained among them and would have turned with greater vigor and efficiency to all moral and social tasks lying about them.[2]

Thus the church, even in its polity and pattern influences the culture.

Rauschenbusch clearly locates the heart of his ecclesiology in primitive Christianity along with left-wing Protestant history, both the Continental Anabaptism and the Puritan synthesis of Calvinism and sectarianism. Already, Rauschenbusch has been quoted in his speech, "The Church and Money Power," suggesting that the farther down we go in the class structure the closer one comes to the left-wing forces of the Anabaptists and that together these interpenetrate to give us the nearest to a truly Christian church and culture. The lower classes need the sectarian church and the sectarian church needs the lower classes. He always correlates polity and politics against the background of class. The following is an example of this conception:

In the English Revolution the political attitude of each section was

---

[1] Christianity and the Social Crisis, pp. 192-193.

[2] Ibid., p. 193.

> quite accurately graded according to its ecclesiastical radicalism. The Episcopalians were for the king; the Presbyterians were for a strong Parliament; the Independents were republicans, and *vice versa*.[1]

Rauschenbusch also, quite characteristically, based much of his ecclesiology on the early Christian community, a common sectarian emphasis. "Wherever, Christianity came," he wrote, "we see a new society nucleating."[2] He calls this "the society-making force of primitive Christianity."[3] He loves to emphasize the revolutionary impact of the early church:

> It tore down the existing barriers with irresistible force and brought men together by a new principle of straification. Jews were wrenched loose from the firm hold of their race and religion; Greeks from their culture and pleasures; and both joined on a footing of equality. Spiritual affinity triumphed over the strongest bonds that hold men together. The call of Jesus to give up home and property, reputation and life, for his sake, was treasured in the collection of his sayings because it corresponded to the actual experience of so many of his followers. *The society making force can be measured by the obstacles it had to overcome.*[4] (Italics Mine)

Then he reveals the communitarian dimension of the early church:

> The churches of the first generation were not churches in our sense of the word. They were not communities for the performance of a common worship, so much as communities with a common life. They were social communities with a religious basis. A common religious experience and hope brought them together but the community of life extended to far more than that. They prayed together but they also ate together. They had no church buildings but met in the homes of their members. That in itself was an influence against ecclesiasticism and for social intimacy. They had a rudimentary organization, as every human society is sure to have, but they had no official clergy distinct from the laity. They were democratic organizations of plain people.[5]

Here, then, is the society-making potential of the early Christian community: it tears down that which is false and then binds together the true in a simple, primitive democracy.

In addition to primitive Christianity, Anabaptists and Puritans, Rauschenbusch was influenced by Richard Heath and Emil De Laveleye. At this point the question is posed as to how convincing the evidence is that Richard Heath's book, Captive City of God, influenced Rauschenbusch. It is the contention of this study that it is highly probable that this background was actually formative in Rauschenbusch's development.

---

[1] *Ibid.* [2] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 118. [4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 119-200.

Richard Heath was a non-conformist minister in the English Baptist church where he was also a pioneer in Anabaptist research, publishing in 1895: Anabaptism From Its Rise at Zwickau to its Fall at Müster 1521-1536 (London: Alexander and Shepheard). In this book he utilizes the Continental scholars known to both August and Walter Rauschenbusch. These included Cornelius, Loserth, Keller and Müller. In addition to his status as Baptist minister and Anabaptist scholar, Richard Heath was an ardent advocate of the social message of the Gospel in Britain. This led to his Captive City of God published first 1898 and then in a 1905 second edition. In a sense it is an English equivalent of Christianity and the Social Crisis despite the fact that it did not create the impact which Rauschenbusch's first book did.

The evidence, first of all, comes from a living eye-witness who testifies to the outstanding influence of this book on Rauschenbusch. Professor Gottschalk emphasizes the value of eye-witnesses as primary sources of evidence. This eye-witness observed in the Crozer Quarterly that "Rauschenbusch was so influenced by Heath's Captive City of God that he distributed copies to his classes."[1] Professor C. H. Moehlman is this eye-witness. He was first Rauschenbusch's student, and then his substitute during a trip to Europe and then successor in the chair of church history. There is no available evidence that Rauschenbusch even promoted another book as much as this one by Richard Heath.

Rauschenbusch himself adds testimony to the eye-witness. In his first book he urged the reader to see Captive City of God by "my friend Richard Heath, a book written with searching insight and prophetic power."[1] This quotation implies a personal friendship with Heath which would increase the possibility of formative influence. In his second book he urges a total reexamination of church history with the following blanket endorsement of Heath: "The various writings of Richard Heath exemplify the spirit in which the material ought to be approached."[2] This statement commends the writings of Heath as a whole and also the over-all orientation of these books.

---

[1] C. H. Moehlman, Crozer Quarterly, XXII, 46.

From eye-witness and from Rauschenbusch come two strands of evidence concerning Captive City of God. Rauschenbusch refers to the author as a personal friend who has insight, prophetic power, and the proper over-all spirit for understanding the church in history.

It is still possible that this book was only confirmatory of what Rauschenbusch already believed. No doubt Rauschenbusch was prepared to accept this material from a sectarian-minded Baptist with radical social passion. No doubt the emphasis on a radical sectarian church with a sharp impact on the working class was an idea Rauschenbusch was also prepared for. Yet, the testimony of the eye-witness was that this book did not merely reflect things which Rauschenbusch believed but was part of the originating process. Beyond this we cannot go except to look at the basic argument of the book to see what specifically might have influenced the Rochester historian.

Written in a polemical style, the book is a radical attack on the alienation of the church from the working classes because of materialism, middle class apathy and capitalistic injustice. The church is actually portrayed as apostate. Heath offers figures to show that on the Continent, in Great Britain and in the United States the working classes are basically lost to the church.

The loss of the working classes is due, according to Heath:

---

[1] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 298.

[2] Christianity and the Social Order, p. 70.

> . . . not so much to doubts about the truth of the Christian religion as to a settled conviction that the churches do not truly represent it.[1]

At another point he quotes an American minister and then comments on this observation:

> 'I say without fear or favour, the preacher is just as much a slave today as he would be if sold to the highest bidder. And I for one am tired of such a damnable state of things.'
>
> The cause is evident--the Christian people of today are so infected with the business spirit that they know of none but its ideals and cannot imagine any order of things not governed by its rules.[2]

This apostasy is true both of the Anglican church and the nonconformist churches, the former because it is inherently incapable of reaching the people, and the latter because it is temporarily incapable of doing so. The Gospel to the poor the Church of England does not, never has and never can preach.[3] The reason is that the church is unified with the state, and the English state is an oligarchicyl constituted for the protection of property, and the maintenance of the power of the wealthy few over the poor majority. In addition, the English church condones war, penal sadism and other evil policies.

The nonconformist churches are also ineffective because they are plagued with Mammonistic middle class prejudices. He quotes with approval a conference between Nonconformity and labor in 1867 where labor dropped the following bombshell:

> They emphatically asserted the thorough worldliness both the State Church and of the Dissent; the former, they said, was rotten to the core, the latter a system of religious commercialism. They again insisted that ministers showed no interest in social questions. They objected to class distinctions in a place of worship, to the nature of the sermons preached, to the formality of worship, and to the want of freedom of speech. The Churches they described as a mere reflex of the world, where the classes similarly divided in rank, barred and bolted and double-locked their doors against all inferior to them; while the man who should most of all have been free from caste feeling--the minister--was in effect a member of the dominant class, sympathising with it and acting in its interest. Since this plain speaking there have been no more conferences in London between

---

[1] Richard Heath, The Captive City of God (London: Headley Bros., 1905), p. 26.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 48. [3] *Ibid*., pp. 75-76.

Nonconformity and Labor.[1]

What is the answer to this ghastly captivity?

First, the Free Churches must demonstrate democracy in their own churches and let this flow out into the social order:

> The most effective way for the Free Churches to improve the social conditions of the People of this country is to educate their own members in democratic ideas, so as to show the Democratic ideal at work in themselves producing a truly divine society. This would be an object lesson indeed.[2]

Both Rauschenbusch and Heath have a combination of pessimism about the empirical churches and unbounded optimism as to the creative role of a really, radical, prophetic, proletarian, democratic church which would become a small scale working model for the total culture. Both men are sectarians with specific roots in Anabaptist and Puritan life and thought; and both lay great stress on the original normative pattern of the early church. The Captive City of God has a chapter on "Early Christianity and the Democratic Ideal" which makes much of the anti-property communism of the early church and the generally dynamic and creative role of the primitive *koinonia*. The following passage shows how he views the relation of communism to later relationships to property:

> Communism it is evident, was regarded by the Fathers as the only natural form of society, but as long as men had not faith and love enough to adopt it spontaneously, and to maintain it voluntarily, the principle of private property must be endured, and property held in a communistic spirit. And thus the Fathers, notwithstanding their tolerance of property holder, only really had the right to what was necessary to his own existence and self-development, and that this right was based on the common right of all men to share in the usufruct of the earth. Of the rest he was simply the steward of goods to be used on behalf of those who had none, and which if he appropriated to his own use the Fathers did not hesitate to call him a thief. If that was not communism there never was such a thing.[3]

Though at times Heath makes the church only the more inspired dimension of a democratic society, he returns to the theme of the great role of the church:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 93. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

> The Church does not exist to do the work of the Civil ruler, the philanthropic citizen and the stage manager, nor does it exist simply to be a fold where the sheep may securely feed, but the Church exists to be a City in which a Divine Society may develop. It has to witness for God and the Kingdom of Heaven, and so to keep before the world the highest standard of life.[1]

This passage introduces the theme of the Kingdom of Heaven which is a perfect equivalent for the meaning of Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God. It is the Reign of God coming to the earth, preferably in the church first of all and then into society; but, in any case, in the whole culture. Heath is perhaps more reluctant than Rauschenbusch to see human concern coming apart from the church. As he (Heath) puts it: "Apathy to the Cause of Christ tends to apathy to the Cause of the people, while apathy to the cause of the people tends to apathy to the Cause of Christ." There is a strong emphasis on justice but also some ambiguity on its relation to love.

But the ecclesiology of Rauschenbusch no doubt was influenced by Richard Heath, left-wing English Baptist and student of the Anabaptists. Both Rauschenbusch and Heath agree that the culture has corrupted the church but a radical sectarian church could lead the masses in redeeming the culture. Heath strongly believed that the latter option is forever closed to the Church of England and similar state churches.

The final paragraph in Heath's book on Anabaptism contains this moving tribute to the eternal power of these Continental sectarians, (a passage which Rauschenbusch would have fully supported):

> Anabaptism is not dead; it slumbers in the heart of the poor man, and will assuredly rise again. For the voice that proclaimed liberty of conscience in Christendom, to which, therefore, we owe all that results therefrom--liberty of thought, liberty of worship, free speech and a free press--the voice that proclaimed the Common Life to be of far higher importance than the individual life, the true community to be the divine unit rather than the individual, the family, or the nation--that voice cannot be hushed in any tomb, or kept silent under the heavy stone of conventional religion. For that voice is not in one man only, but in all.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 145.

> It is the eternal conscience of the universe, the Light which lighteth every man, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. It cries for justice from all to all, for love from all to all. It knows no favorites makes no distinctions. But all who share the joy hidden in its sorrow must be willing to endure its conflicts and humiliations, to hang upon its cross and enter its tomb, and so to arrive at the land where Justice and Love victorious. For there is no real crown in the universe but the crown of thorns. The only head that will forever remain royal is the head of the Sufferer.[1]

This is Richard Heath, a major influence in the thinking of Walter Rauschenbusch.

Emil De Laveleye was a Belgian economist with a background in the Roman Catholic church. He was born in 1822 and died in 1892. His name was chief associated bimetallism and primitive property but Rauschenbusch was particularly influenced by a small book which the Encyclopedia Brittanica does not even list among his important works. It is called, Protestantism and Catholicism In Their Bearing Upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations. This book published in 1875 contains an introduction by the Right Honorable W. E. Gladstone, Member of Parliament. A cursory reading of this book will suggest its radically Protestant character and reveal why De Laveleye is referred to four different times in Christianity and the Social Crisis. It also suggests why Laveleye is reported to have left the Roman church later in his career.

Like Heath and Rauschenbusch, Laveleye believes that religion is highly creative and suggestive in the political realm, leading to the organization of state forms borrowed from religion.[2] In actual fact, Laveleye's aforementioned book is really an attack on the pathological impact of the Roman Church on economic and political life; and, on the other hand, the creative and healthy interaction between Protestantism, particularly left-wing Protestantism, on economic and political life.

---

[1] Richard Heath, Anabaptism, op. cit., pp. 193-194.

[2] Emil DeLaveleye, Protestantism and Catholicism In Their Bearing Upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations (London: John Murray, 1875), pp. 27-28.

He shows how Catholic countries must rely on Renaissance paganism. On the other hand, Protestant countries do not have such a dichotomy between morals and religion. As a matter of fact as regards England and America he observes:

> In England and America things are different: the most decided partisans of liberty are at the same time those who profess the most severe morality--namely, the Puritans and the Quakers. While Bousuet was formulating the theory of absolutism, Milton was writing that of the Republic, and it was the Puritans who founded liberty in England and the United States. In one case the writers who are religious and moral preach slavery, whilst those who advocate liberty respect neither religion nor morals: in the other, on the contrary, the same men stand up at once for religion, morals and liberty.[1]

Another statement is his conclusion on the difference between the French Revolution and the democratic upheavals in Holland, England and America:

> For the foundation of a state, the Christianity of Penn and of Washington is a better cement than the philosophy of Vergniaud, of Robespierre, and of Mirabeau.[2]

As far as America is concerned, this is not his last word. He has words of praise for Roger Williams, too. "This man," Laveleye says, "is a name little known on our continent but which deserves to be inscribed amongst those of the benefactors of mankind. In a world which four-thousand years of intolerance had bathed in blood, even before Decartes had established free research in philosophy, he was first to sanction religious liberty as a political right."[3]

He also commends the Quakers of Pennsylvania and New Jersey for founding states on similar principles. Over against this he contrasts the experience of France which persecuted, strangled and banished "those of her children who had become Protestants," and thus failed to develop those germs of liberty and self government which had survived in the provincial states.[4] In other words, Free Protestantism contains the germs of liberty while Roman despotism left the legacy of wild paganism and brittle despotism.

---

[1] *Ibid*. [2] *Ibid*., p. 29.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 43. [4] *Ibid*., p. 46.

Over and over Laveleye repeats his analysis:

1. Free and representative government is the logical consequence of Protestantism; absolute government is the consequence of Rome.

2. Protestantism unites a nation; Catholicism divides it into dangerous, angry conflict.

3. Protestantism diffuses knowledge; Rome tends to suppress knowledge.

4. Protestantism initiates education and science which lead to prosperity; Catholic nations lack this sequence and have more poverty.

5. The highest Protestant ethic is moral duty; to Rome it is honor.

6. Protestantism tends to keep the intellectuals; Rome alienates the intellectuals.

7. The Puritan and left-wing Protestants are the most creative in the culture.

Once again, Rauschenbusch received support for his vigorous ecclesiology: state forms and economic forms are borrowed from religious forms. Religious institutions are dominant in the culture--whether for good or evil. Free Protestantism is the most desirable religious form to attain the democratic end.

In comparison with Heath, one finds in Laveleye a much more optimistic reading of the cultural role of Protestantism. But perhaps this is only a difference on the surface. Both Leveleye and Heath agree that Free Protestant institutions are crucial for the culture. Heath is speaking for Free Protestantism in crying out that the left-wing Protestants as well as the Catholic type of church are sick. The Catholics cannot come back to health but the sectarians could come back.

In the original reference regarding Richard Heath in Christianizing the Social Order, Rauschenbusch also recommends H. C. Vedder's Socialism and the

Ethics of Jesus, especially Chapter XI, "The Social Failure of the Church."[1] Henry C. Vedder was a fellow-Baptist, holding the chair of church history at Crozer Theological Seminary. Vedder dedicated his volume, Reformation in Germany, to Rauschenbusch as follows: "To the prophet of the New Reformation to whom this story of an older struggle for liberty is inscribed with all esteem and affection."[2]

Vedder finds the roots of modern socialism among the Anabaptists although he is careful to point out that not all Anabaptists were collectivists and that they were more inclined to communism in the primitive sense than to socialism. Despite the tragic outcome of the Moravian Anabaptist communists (later known as Hutterites) he feels that it is suggestive to us both negatively and positively.

For him, Luther lacked interest in ethics and Calvin's theology tended toward aristocracy and monarchy. This suggests the Anabaptists as having the dynamic view of life which demanded cultural and ethical changes.

The passage which reveals Vedder's view is the following:

> The one party during the Reformation struggle that had some apprehension of the gospel of Jesus that made some attempt to proclaim anew his teachings and to realize his ideals, the Anabaptists, were overwhelmed with obloquy and persecuted to extermination. It is quite true they were not a homogeneous party, and that some among them gave just cause of offence by their fanaticism, their appeal to the sword, and their immorality. But these were not the real reasons why the Anabaptists were so reprobated by the reformers, so persecuted by all governments--these were merely the plausible excuses for the relentless bitterness with which they were suppressed. The Anabaptists were despised and rejected for the same reason that Jesus was rejected and despised--they announced a gospel that, if accepted, would have required and produced a reorganization of society on the principle of human brotherhood. Sixteenth century Europe was no more

---

[1] P. 70.

[2] Vedder was also the author of Balthasar Hübmaier and in general showed wide learning in Anabaptist materials of fifty years ago. His chapter on the Anabaptists in Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus recommends Kautsky, Bax and Heath as bibliography. His chapter on the "Social Failure of the Church" recommends Harnack, Wernle, Weizsäcker, Schmidt, Ulhorn, Weiss, Sabatier, Wrede, Pfleiderer, Geffcken, Hergenröther and Stevens.

> ready for such a gospel than twentieth-century Europe is.[1]

Here we see one more influence in Rauschenbusch's sectarian ecclesiology: the left-wing gives maximum creativity in the culture because in seeking to recreate itself in the culture it develops democracy and brotherhood. The left-wing and conventional capitalistic culture exist in radical conflict. Rauschenbusch recommended Vedder and Vedder recommended Rauschenbusch, listing Christianity and the Social Crisis in the last chapter of his book on socialism as one of the basic books on the social question.[2]

This, then, is the Rauschenbusch ecclesiology: the true church is a disciplined, democratic, voluntary association which has a direct effect on social institutions. This is rooted in the sectarian churches with influence from Richard Heath, Anabaptist scholar and Nonconformist of England; Emile De Laveleye, a Roman-nurtured anti-Catholic who sees churches as master blueprints for the culture and Henry C. Vedder, Baptist scholar of the left-wing and proponent of Christian socialism. Few concepts are more important to Rauschenbusch than his concept of the church. A final crucial concept remains.

9. The philosophy of history of the Kingdom: the Kingdom comes by evolutionary gradualism and by distinct periodizations[3] of which his day was one of the richest of all history

When Rauschenbusch published his first major work in 1907 he believed that he was living in the fourth and climactic period of history. This fourth period is one of a series which started in the Renaissance. These are his words:

---

[1] Henry C. Vedder, Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914), pp. 475-476.

[2] Ibid., p. 482. Others listed here: Peabody, Shailer Mathews, Ely, Campbell, Stelze, C. R. Brown, Hodges, Reichert, Thompson and Spargo.

[3] By periodization we mean Rauschenbusch's conception that the Kingdom of God breaks through into history with varying degrees of intensity and through changing religious and cultural movements. Each of the latter has its own unique character. The changing eras or periods dominated by one of these Kingdom-bearing movements is the essential meaning of periodization.

> The modern emancipation of the intellectual life began in the Renaissance of the fifteenth century and is not finished yet. The modern emancipation of the religious life began in the Reformation of the sixteenth century and is not finished yet. The modern emancipation of the political life began in the Puritan revolution of the seventeenth century and is not finished yet. The modern emancipation of the industrial life began in the nineteenth century and is not finished yet. Let us have patience. Let us have hope. And above all let us have faith.[1]

What makes the present day so unique as a great and momentous period in history?

For one thing the past reasons for the churches' failure to respond to Christianization in the social order have disappeared or have been weakened in modern life. They were not *inherent* in the church, nor were they a tragic but inevitable ingredient of history. These nine reasons, now all but gone, were:

1. The impossibility of any social propaganda in the first centuries
2. Postponement until the Lord's coming
3. Hostility to the Empire and its civilization
4. Ascetic tendencies
5. Monasticism
6. Sacramentalism
7. Dogmatic interests
8. Disappearance of church democracy
9. Lack of scientific comprehension[2]

Particularly important is the setting aside of the apocalyptic idea: "The idea of the Kingdom of God must slough off apocalypticism if it is to become the religious property of the modern world."[3] To be sure there are apocalyptic dimensions to the New Testament but these are not in the mind of Jesus. The church "spilled a little of the lurid colors of its own apocalypticism over the loftier conceptions of the Master."[4]

---

[1] *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 142. [2] *Ibid*., Chapter IV.

[3] *Christianity and the Social Order*, p. 56. [4] *Ibid*., p. 63.

Progress is evolutionary but progress is not inevitable. "History laughs," he declares, "at the optimistic illusion that nothing can stand in the way of progress." The important point is that the substitution of the evolutionary for the apocalyptic is an important reason why this is a key period, a billiant climax to the series starting in the Renaissance.

In saying this Rauschenbusch tries to understand the original historical context of eschatology. All along eschatology has been influenced by social causes. First the Jews under political oppression and dictatorship developed an eschatology and then the Christians under persecution were similarly stimulated. In a memorable phrase he says that the Jews and early Christians "wept and prayed our eschatology into existence. Our Apocalypse is wet with human tears and must be read that way. Ever since, some sections of eschatology have been vivified, others modified, and some consigned to oblivion through the pressure of social causes. Has not the social consciousness of our age, speaking through the social gospel, also a right to be heard in the shaping of eschatology?"[1] Thus, a historically-conditioned Apocalypse meets the new historical conditions of the social gospel's eschatology.

Today argued Rauschenbusch, a number of forces have converged to give our age a brilliant period if we will continue to recognize the precious opportunity.

First, modern Christianity is more of a movement and less of an institution. By sloughin off, asceticism, monasticism, sacramentalism, dogmatism, clericalism and embracing its spiritual impact on society the spiritual conditions are arriving for the new period.

Second, the intellectual conditions are also at hand. Travel and history and revealing that social relations are plastic and variable. The new sciences of political economy and sociology are here to guide us. Biblical criticism is making the Bible a more lifelike, social book. Thus the inescapable conclusion:

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 215.

> For the first time in religious history we have the possibility of so directing religious energy by scientific knowledge that a comprehensive and continuous reconstruction of social life in the name of God is within the bounds of human possibility.[1]
>
> Christ is immanent in humanity and is slowly disciplining the nations and lifting them to a share in his spirit. By great processes of self-purification the alien infusions in Christianity have been eliminated and Christianity itself is being converted to Christ.[2]
>
> We are today in the midst of a revolutionary epoch fully as thorough as that of the Renaissance and the Reformation.[3]

There is a curious vacillation in Rauschenbusch between a scientific idiom to explain this new period and, on the other hand, a Christian vocabulary. While admitting the very real possibility of failure which once again will disappoint Christ he concluded one of his lyrical outbursts about periodization as follows:

> But for the present the East is aflame with the Day of Jehovah, and a thousand voices are calling. If failure comes, may it find our sword broken at the hilt.[4]

Or again, Rauschenbusch frames his hopes in the language of the inspired prophet:

> Our bitter need will drive us to repentance. The prophetic spirit will awaken among us. The tongue of fire will descend on twentieth-century men and will give them great faith, joy and boldness, and then we shall hear a new evangel and it will be the Old Gospel.[5]

This outlines, in brief compass, the pattern of Rauschenbusch's philosophy of history. The Kingdom will fully come. The Kingdom is coming gradually in an evolutionary manner. Its coming is the climax of a series of periodizations starting in the fifteenth (Renaissance), the sixteenth (Reformation), the seventeenth (Puritanism) and now the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Kingdom of God socialism).

---

[1] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 209. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 45. [4] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 29.

[5] Ibid., p. 29.

In a sense the foregoing gives the roots of Rauschenbusch's concept of periodization. The Renaissance will be discussed in the following chapter; and socialism will be treated more fully in the chapter on Calvinist and Catholic universalism. This leaves three characteristic centers for origins of periodization:

1. The primitive apostolic church
2. The Anabaptists
3. The Puritans especially as mediated through the Baptists and Congregationalists

He saw the early church as a revolutionary movement which jolted Judaism out of its racism and legalism; a movement which challenged the culture and hedonism. It tore down the existing barriers "with irresistible force" and "brought men together by a new principle of stratification."[1] The fraternalism, the democracy, the communism, even the political implications of millennialism combined to make the primitive church one of the most pregnant moments and periods of history.

Frequently we have seen how Rauschenbusch viewed the Anabaptist movement as a unique moment in history. In his essay on "The Freedom of Spiritual Religion" he noted:

> In the long, slow sweep of four centuries, often by devious and pathetic ways, the course of religious development for the Protestant world has been in the direction marked out by the swift rush of the radical parties of the Reformation.[2]

His phrase "swift rush" is a vivid phrase for the special power of the Reformation periodization. Or again, he has observed:

> Anabaptist doctrine finally took hold of the proletarian masses, the rabble of the cities and the peasants of the country. It was the revolutionary kind of doctrine, brimful of social applications of Christianity.[3]

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, op. cit., p. 118.

[2] Rauschenbusch, "The Freedom of Spiritual Religion," op. cit., p. 13.

[3] "The Church and Money Power," op. cit., p. 51.

When he shared the platform with Washington Gladden in Boston in 1908 he included the Baptist and Congregational Puritans among those who moulded a distinct period of history and then spelled out what he meant by this idea of a revolutionary era. The Springfield Daily Republican reported him as follows:

> Professor Rauschenbusch spoke on 'The revolutionary ancestry of the Congregationalists and Baptists.' He undertook to show that they originated together in a revolutionary age. They were the exponents of that revolution and its prime movers, both in religion and in politics. Apparently they were defeated at the time, but in fact they were successful and their great aims have helped to create the modern world. The revolutionary spirit is embodied in their constitution and traditions. This constitutes both a call and a qualification to do their full duty in the social revolution which is now upon us.[1]

Thus having shown that the Baptists and Congregationalists originated in an epoch of revolution and that today (1908) there is another revolution underway, Rauschenbusch defines what he means by revolution:

> The speaker made it plain that he meant by 'revolution' not a transitory violent outbreak, but a large historical change in the fundamental convictions and institutions of a nation or an age. It might last a century or two.[2]

Revolution, then, is a synonym for period; and period means a large historical change in the fundamental convictions and institutions which may last several centuries. If one couples this with his particular concept of the ascending periodization starting with the Renaissance through the twentieth century then we see the Rauschenbusch conception of history. It is interesting to note that while he assigns great importance to the distinctly religious periods, he does not limit historical periodization to these periods. He includes the Renaissance as well as the Reformation, the socialistic-industrial revolution as well as the Puritans.

The literature on historical periodization is now quite rich. For example, Frank J. Wray's dissertation under Roland Bainton at Yale in 1953, History in the Eyes of the Sixteenth Century Anabaptists. Here we see a summary of the role of periodization. He clearly divides the Anabaptists into the evangelicals and the radicals--it is obvious that Rauschenbusch belongs with the radicals more than the evangelicals. The evangelicals generally divided history into two periods with the Incarnation as the dividing point. Ultimate victory was in a transcendent age after the Last Judgment and was beyond the limits of time. The apostolic church had fallen from its original purity with some believing that the True Church had ceased to exist while other evangelical Anabaptists believed that it existed in dispersion. In any case, they believed that the True Church would be restored. Many Anabaptists recognizes the work of the Reformers in preparing the way for the restitution of the church but a majority of the Anabaptists looked upon themselves to accomplish this task. The evangelicals were eschatologically oriented believing the end of the age was near at hand and the focus was on the Last Judgment.

---

[1] The Springfield Daily Republican, op. cit. [2] Ibid.

On the other hand, the radicals had three periods of history rather than two. The third age was in the future in which the Kingdom of God would be established on earth. Some of the radicals identified this terrestial Kingdom of God with the millennium and some did not. The radicals at Münster attempted to restore the ancient Kingdom of Israel as a prelude to the second advent.

Wray believes that this radical Kingdom-on-earth period was implied in second century Montanism which taught that the age of the Spirit had come and that Montanus was the promised Paraclete, hence, a third spiritual age follows the earlier ages of the Old and New Testaments. In the twelfth century the theory of the three ages was revived. Early in this century Gerhard of York designated the first age of history as that of the Old Testament in which the Kingdom of God was prefigured in the Kingdom and priesthood of Israel. In the second advent of Christ is that of the true kingdom and priesthood of Christ. The third age prefigured by the second, is the eternal New Jerusalem which will have no priesthood.

Joachim of Flora (c. 1131-c. 1202) had the greater influence, conceiving of the three basic periods into which the total span of time within history should be divided. These are related to the three persons of the Trinity. The first, that of the Father, is the Old Testament period. The second is that of the Son, the age of the New Testament and the Church. Joachim believed that the second age was drawing to a close and soon the age of the Holy Spirit would dawn. The first age was one of law, knowledge, servitude and fear. The second, that of grace, wisdom, sonship and faith. The third, one of full grace, freedom and love. Also each has a different ethic. For example, the age of the Father divorce and polygamy were permitted; in the age of the Son it was forbidden but in the age of the Spirit compromise will be abolished. This Joachimite formula greatly influenced the Spiritual Franciscans.

Wray points out that Thomas Müntzer acknowledged that he had read the commentary on Jeremiah attributed to Joachim of Flora. But, he denied Joachim had any influence on his views since Müntzer preferred the idea of the fifth monarchy to Joachim's third age.

Certain characteristics of the Joachimite tradition were shown by Melchior Hoffmann with the usual two ages followed by a concrete historical period, a New Jerusalem. This was not the Millennium which he believed had started in apostolic times, an idea which amillennialism still adhers to.

David Joris also reflects the Joachimite tradition in his conception of the three Davidic periods. The first age of the Old Testament is represented by David the famous King of Israel; the second is Jesus Christ, the greatest of all Davids who has destroyed Goliath and routed the uncircumcized Philistines. The third David is Joris himself, the least of the three and a servant of Christ. His task is to be the ambassador of the third age of the Spirit. The first age was one of polygamy, the second of monogamy and the third one of celibacy.

There is a substantial unity, then, among Joachim, Hoffman and Joris in viewing both the past and the present.

The radicals at Munster, however, take a different interpretation of both the past and the future. The first was the period from Adam to Noah; the second and present one extends from Noah to the time of "the Restitution of all things." The key here is that like the Noachic destruction through the flood, the second age will also end in the destruction of the wicked. The agent of destruction for Noah was water; the second will be fire. In the third age of the Kingdom of Christ is literally established on earth.

These are only a few brief summaries selected at random from Professor Wray's study. No mention has been made of his equally rich materials dealing with numerous figures outside of the Anabaptist movement, showing that periodization belongs in the context of pre-Reformation philosophies of history as well.

Turning to a better known figure in socio-historical studies, there is the argument of Karl Mannheim in Ideology and Utopia. He refers to the orgiastic chiliasm of the Anabaptist as the first form of Utopian mentality, boldly declaring:

> The decisive turning-point in modern history was, from the point of view of our problem, the moment in which 'Chiliasm' joined forces with the active demands of the oppressed strata of society. The very idea of the dawn of a millennial kingdom on earth always contained a revolutionizing tendency and the church made every effort to paralyze this situationally transcendent idea with all the means at its command. These intermittently reviving doctrines reappeared again in Joachim of Flora among others, but ~~in his~~ case they were not as yet revolutionizing. In the Hussites, however, and then in Thomas Munzer and the Anabaptists these ideas became transformed into the activistic movements of specific social strata. Longings which up to that time had been either unattached to a specific goal or concentrated upon other-worldly objectives suddenly took on a mundane complexion. They were now felt to be realizable here and now--and infused social conduct with singular zeal.[1]

---

[1] Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (New York: Harcourt, Bracr and Co., 1936), pp. 211-212.

Therefore, the radical Anabaptist periodization focused on earthly objectives via chiliasm and this led to an activist-utopian-radical mentality which culminated in vigorous modern social movements. Hence, Rauschenbusch and the social gospel can be understood against this background. (The inference concerning Rauschenbusch is mine.)

Rauschenbusch appears to be rooted in the radical Anabaptists of the Hoffman and Joris type who see a third age dawning within history itself. James Luther Adams has underscored what very likely was the more complete basis of Rauschenbusch's outlook when he generalized on the development of periodization in modern times:

> In the Renaissance and the Reformation the humanists and the left-wing sects of Protestantism in varying ways proclaimed a new age. Gradually the 'periodization' was accepted which is now taken for granted by the typical modern man--the division of history into three periods: Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Modern Era. Time is no longer the enemy, for history is believed to be the arena of progress. The forward-driving impulse of Jewish and Christian dynamic conceptions of history was implicit in the movements for renewal and reform--movements looking toward the liberation of man from ecclesiastical and political tyranny, movements that made headway, not without dust and heat.[1]

In any case, Rauschenbusch viewed the twentieth century as a time of peculiarly exceptional vitality and creativity, a New Age, climaxing other creative moments of the past. It was one of the master convictions of the social gospel movement as a whole. Rauschenbusch had a concept with his unique combination of sectarian, idealistic, and Catholic-Calvinist influence. In subsequent chapters these very substantial contributions will be spelled out--especially the debt which he owed to Ragaz and Kutter on the eschatological and religious meaning of socialism.

Summary on Sectarian Influences

We have concluded the two parts of the sectarian background. First the early start in sectarian research and second the archetectonic structure of his Kingdom of God ethics in which sectarian motifs are freely utilized. While many scholars have overlooked the pietistic legacy in Rauschenbusch even more have not adequately given a rightful place to this sectarian dimension of his thought.

---

[1] James Luther Adams, "Our Responsibility in Society," Authority and Freedom, International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom, (Delft-Holland: W. Gaade N. V., 1952)

He rejects any withdrawal tendencies in the non-aggressive sects. He rejects their tragic sense of history even though elements remain at the edge of his thinking. He uses the teleology of the Kingdom as prior in importance to redemption. He pours considerable liberal content into the moulds of sectarianism even when he retains the forms. Yet the sectarian impact on the origins of his ethics is still highly important.

Among the sectarian themes which comes through either in form or content or both are the following:

First, the location of the Kingdom of God as the Reign of God on earth as over against the mystics, the Catholics and apocalyptic conceptions of the Kingdom. He corrects the sectarians by making the boundaries of the Kingdom outside of the koinonia.

Second, he has a strong Kingdom-consciousness like the sectarians. This tends to create energy, zeal and revolutionary audacity. The Bible and justification are replaced by the Holy Spirit and the Kingdom of God with the latter as the basic emphasis.

Third, he accepts discipleship and apostolate as leading to suffering and cultural conflict but broadens the apostolate to include those secular prophets and social workers who have not formally accepted Christ.

Fourth, he accepts the sectarian teaching that the purpose of the Kingdom is to Christianize all the life about it but he gives this a much more socio-economic definition in relation to social movements outside the church.

Fifth, he retains the sectarian emphasis on the primacy of love but seeks to "socialize" love in order that he may get beyond a churchly and familistic context into the social order as a whole, particularly because of the solidarity of the human family.

Sixth, he is moved by the sectarian quest for churchly poverty and working class orientation to develop a sociology which takes cognizance of economic factors as organized into super-personal institutions of evil--this is countered by the super-personal Kingdom of God.

Seventh, he accepts the sectarian emphasis on the church as a disciplined, democratic voluntary association which begets other similar institutions in the culture as a whole. Now he pursues this more self-consciously than the sectarians who did not always explicitly seek similar institutions to their voluntary church life.

Eighth, he accepts the sectarian feeling for a philosophy of history stressing periodization but integrates this with a feeling that the scientific age is also a special moment of revelation in our time.

Even with a modified sectarianism it is now clear why Reckitt of the Church of England attacked Rauschenbusch for constructing a social ethic which the Anglicans could not accept because of ecclesiastical, sacramental and theological differences.

Lest this summary be overly neat, let us point out that some of these synthesized concepts remained in great tension.

The discipleship emphasis remained in tension with his sturdy institutional analysis derived from liberalism.

Love as fulfillment and love which is tragic remain in tension.

Pessimism about the empirical churches remains in tension with his hopefulness about the role of creative, radical, democratic churches.

His periodized view of history remains in tension with his tendency to think in terms of Progress.

The emphasis on discipleship and a non-literalistic view of the Bible remain in tension.

The Baptist sectarianism remains in tension with a genuine catholicity of spirit on church questions.

These and other tensions remained. But the sectarian dimension was too basic to his system of Kingdom of God ethics to be fully withdrawn regardless of its tension with other factors.

The study of the sectarian origins in this chapter is necessary to see the unique role of sectarianism in relation to liberalism, pietism and transformationism as one of the four motifs in his Kingdom of God ethics.

The next chapter on liberalism is also quite basic to understand the origins of his outlook.

CHAPTER IV

THE INFLUENCE OF LIBERALISM

Rauschenbusch is most widely known as a Christian social thinker whose origins are primarily in liberalism. In the introduction eleven interpreters believed that one could best understand him as a liberal. To H. Richard Niebuhr this is Rauschenbusch's weakness since it was the Christ-of-culture type of liberalism which loses its power of transcendence over culture.[1] To Ralph Henry Gabriel this background and role in liberalism is a high compliment since Rauschenbusch overcame the romantic liberalism of Sheldon and the dogmatic liberalism of Herron to effectively spell out the religious side of the liberal American faith. This liberal American faith already had cultural and political reality but was waiting for someone like Rauschenbusch to plough it back into Christianity.[2]

Niebuhr and Gabriel suggest two foci in the large number of representative thinkers who approach Rauschenbusch with this key of liberalism. Despite the fact that Rauschenbusch is most widely and commonly known as a liberal, it is the argument of this study that this consensus of opinion does not adequately probe into the interaction of the liberal motif with the other motifs. And particularly since this interaction reveals once again Rauschenbusch's originality. Rauschenbusch emerges in this study not as a carbon-copy of liberalism but as a creative thinker who freely appropriates materials from each stream of influence and all the patterns of origination.

---

[1] H. R. Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 100.

[2] Ralph Henry Gabriel, op. cit., pp. 324-330.

Special attention is devoted to Ritschl in order to illustrate one of the major examples of his free and independent encounter with a major liberal thinker. Rauschenbusch and Ritschl are compared and contrasted on nine different issues. Above all, this analysis is centered around the theme which linked them together, namely, the Kingdom of God motif. Ricschl is seen as a basic influence, a genuine original force but in no sense as one who is embraced uncritically and completely. Much influence comes from Ritschl but not the sociology, not the political ethics, and not the doctrine of the church. At the same time, various sectarian themes such as discipleship and the doctrine of the church are retained against Ritschl.

Not only does this chapter show how Rauschenbusch moves freely in criticizing liberalism from the standpoint of other motifs, but also the chapter sheds light on the various kinds of liberalism which shaped his ethics. Within the chapter there is a basic division between the theological, Biblical and historical liberals, on the one hand, and the socio-economic liberals on the other hand. This corresponds with the two-fold definition of liberalism given in the introduction. From the theological liberals come the attack on the Hellenization of theology, rejection of irrational elements in religion, the emphasis on experience, the rejection of confessional dogmatism, the anti-metaphysical outlook, the stress on the historical Jesus, the making of redemption secondary to the teleology of the Kingdom, solidarity in sin and salvation, rejection of the forensic atonement, gradualism and optimism. Chronologically these emphasis of liberal theologians precede the socio-economic thinkers since he encountered the theologians in graduate study before entering more vigorously into ethical encounter. From the socio-economic thinkers and movements come six very formidable contributions to his ethics: a theology of social institutions, the economic interpretation of ethics, the value of socialism, the doctrine of progress, a historical perspective stressing the uniqueness of the new social concern, and a generally eclectic spirit.

The large number of liberal influences also pose questions concerning the other leaders of social concern who preceded him and who had a liberal outlook theologically. For example, the idea of discipleship was emphasized in America by various liberals since the days of Bushnell. Yet there is a difference in those thinkers who stem more directly out of Puritanism than those like Rauschenbusch with more of a sectarian background. The answer is that liberalism is the least common denominator among the various American social prophets. The children of Puritanism start with a transformationist vision rooted in the soveriegnty of God and the Kingdom of God. This essentially Calvinist theology is modified by the neo-Ritschlianism which swept across America with much emphasis on the teachings and example of the historical Jesus. To this modified theology was added the institutional analysis of liberalism and the over-all climate of liberal hopes and liberal methods. In the case of Rauschenbusch, he starts with pietism and sectarianism with the emphasis on discipleship, love, and the Kingdom of God and the church as a democratic, voluntary brotherhood. He then rejects the quietism, borrows transformationism from Puritanism and evangelicalism and exchanges part of his sectarian theology for that of neo-Ritschlianism. Like the children of Puritanism, he adds the institutional analysis of liberalism, its social hopes and much of its methodology. These liberal emphases provide the least common denominator with Bliss, Gladden, Ely and others. Yet the approaches are different from the pietism-sectarian side, on the one hand, and from the Puritan on the other. Once again there is considerable interaction in the free atmosphere of American church and cultural life.

In any case, Rauschenbusch is at work in a moment of great social excitement along liberal lines of emphasis. One meets here a driving faith just beginning to face criticism after being on the offensive for many years. The following quotation conveys the extent to which his loftiest religious concerns are effected by the new liberal climate:

> The new intellectual life of our age, which has proved its own rights by the amazing scientific results of the last one hundred fifty years, has changed the intellectual surroundings of our religious world, too. We must necessarily overhaul all the work done by previous generations, for it was done with the scientific methods and materials then at their command. This involves a simplification and purification of Christianity by returning to the spirit and thought of Jesus. The more scientific and religious life becomes, the closer somehow does it come to Jesus.[1]

This quotation dates our age with the start of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century. It then suggests that the impact of science on religion is very great, demanding basic changes in religion. These changes will, of necessity, bring us closer to Jesus. While not all his utterances are as uncritically liberal as this one, this mood permitted him to drink deeply from the cup of liberalism.

A semi-tragic aspect of Rauschenbusch's liberal origins is that he had set the pattern of his liberal outlook just at the time when Weiss and Schweitzer offered one of the first cogent criticisms in the area of New Testament interpretation. Documentation is offered to show that a radically upsetting point like this one was known to him but rejected. If he had worked this into his thought he would have been less vulnerable to attack.

We may refer to Rauschenbusch as an "Enlightenment liberal" in order to associate his liberalism with the most accurate and meaningful historical category.

Against the background of many orthodoxies, Europe had seen cruel and ravaging religious warfare. There was a deep longing for some kind of common ground which was also more humane and concerned about the welfare of mankind and the richness of human life. The answer appeared in the Aufklarung or Enlightenment which stressed a unifying rationalism and which brought forth a universal religion and universal ethics. Starting in the Reformed countries in the mid-seventeenth century the movement came to France in the eighteenth century and then later in this same period to Germany and the United States. Religiously it was not promoting a blatant, atheistic skepticism. Rather it was a moralistic secularization of the Christian tradition with a sharp focus on an earthly utopia.

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, The Freedom of Spiritual Religion, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

Mead and Nichols suggest three different groups in the Enlightenment with regard to their attitude to revealed religion:

1. Rational supernaturalists, the largest group in Britain and America, represented by the philosopher Locke, Archbishop Tillotson, American Unitarians and, in the first half of the eighteenth century by most articulate English Anglicans and Presbyterians. The basic belief was that revelation was a corroboration of natural religion.

2. The Christian deists were a step more radical since they wanted to purge Christianity of all irrational and peculiar elements. Kant and the neo-Kantians and hence Rauschenbusch would be located in this second category.

3. The anti-Christian deists had no hope for a rationalistic Christian church because they believed that Christianity is inherently linked together with bigotry, persecution and superstition. Thus, Voltaire hoped to see the last king strangled in the bowls of the last priest.[1]

Against this background, we see Rauschenbusch as being influenced by the group more liberal than the rational super-naturalists and less liberal than the anti-Christian deists. Indeed, there never was a time when he was not speaking as a convinced Christian or an active churchman.

Demonstration of Origins

The methods of demonstration of the liberal origins are the same as in previous chapters but, of course, with a different emphasis.

---

[1] Sidney Earl Mead and James Hastings Nichols, "The History of Christianity Since 1650," unpublished lectures notes, University of Chicago, n. d.

With regard to the family background, this is less important than in pietism and sectarianism. Yet we must not underestimate the very early origins of political liberalism in the Rauschenbusch family through the support of the revolution of 1848 in Germany. His uncle, Wilhelm, risked his professional status to defend one hundred of the academic participants in the revolt of 1848.

The Zeitgeist of Germany and America, the latter primarily in terms of New York and Rochester, is quite basic in his development. The opening part of our demonstration of origins will be a survey of experiences with liberal movements in Germany and America which moulded and shaped his thinking. After showing this experiential dimension of his origins as a liberal, we shall then move to more literary developments.

Rauschenbusch's self-image is full of self-consciousness as a participant in a groundswell of liberal affirmation which is essentially compatible with his allegience to other strata of truth previously accepted. It is particularly clear that his Kingdom of God image becomes the master ingredient which integrates these widely scattered elements together in a coherent whole. Considerable time will be spent to show how his selection and rejection of original materials takes place around the Kingdom of God motif. And particularly through Ritschl as his major theological mentor. But as previously suggested this is a free and creative encounter with rejection and acceptance.

Finally, there is considerable enumeration of books and authors who influenced him. These seem to be divided between those that are highly important and those that are more marginal. In theology, for example, Kant, Schleiermächer and Ritschl are highly important in contrast to the marginal role of King, Gladden and W. A. Brown. In Bible Wellhausen is crucial in contrast to Renan Schurer and Kautzsch. In history Harnack stands out above all others. And in the socio-economic sphere George and perhaps Bellamy are highly important and Mazzini, Ruskin, the Webbs and T. Roosevelt are less important.

This chapter, then, will show that the widely-accepted position that liberalism is the basic force in the ethics of Rauschenbusch must be qualified by seeing the way in which he accepts some of the impact of liberal thought but rejects other aspects of it. And, in the manner in which he critically uses a major liberal influence like Ritschl. This will take place with a natural division between the theological-Biblical-historical liberals and the socio-economic liberals. Within this broad matrix Rauschenbusch will be seen as discriminating among many liberal figures, books and movements and how he fails to come to terms with one of the earliest attacks on Biblical liberalism as given by Schweitzer. He will be viewed against the background of Enlightenment approaches to religion with some affinity for but not perfect imitation of the Christian deists. His richly historical view of God was not deistic even though he pursued some aims similar to the Christian deists.

The main purpose of this study is to see more clearly the way in which liberalism constituted an original influence in his ethics. The picture before us will be that of much *liberal content* poured into the *moulds* of *sectarianism* and *pietism*. Yet, even here there must be qualification since some of the *content* of sectarianism is retained in terms of discipleship and of the doctrine of the church.

Before taking up the theological, Biblical, historical, and socio-economic thinkers in a more systematic fashion, it is important to outline the *origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics in experiences which started him in the direction of liberalism and which kept him growing in the liberal context*.

Walter Rauschenbusch's biographer in the Rochester public library has written what is probably a perfect characterization of the situation through these experiences. The librarian, Bruce McKelvey, observed that "the religious stirrings in Rochester around the turn of the century both *influenced* and reflected the career of Walter Rauschenbusch."[1] It is difficult to know when Rauschenbusch is being influenced and when he is reflecting liberal influence. In any case, liberalism is one of the factors pouring in upon Walter Rauschenbusch.

This preliminary section, therefore, traces the stirrings of liberalism directly through the family in Germany, in Rochester as a strategic center of liberal non-conformists (a fact not widely known), and then in New York during the pastorate. Chronologically, New York might preceed Rochester in terms of mature years. Yet Rochester preceded New York in its first impact on Walter Rauschenbusch. Indeed, his birth, boyhood, teens, college, seminary and professorship belong to Rochester. Indeed Germany, Rochester and New York as experiences in liberalism are not to be underestimated in his development.

A. Experiences which influenced Rauschenbusch in the direction of liberalism

1. Family roots in the German revolution of 1848

Walter Rauschenbusch's father was deeply moved by the democratic student movement which eventually culminated in the ill-fated revolution of 1848. The movement suffered defeat, leading to the Bismarckian blood and iron. August Rauschenbusch arrived in the United States in 1846, several years before a stream of liberal Germans who were destined to enrich American liberalism in many ways.

Walter Rauschenbusch's uncle, Wilhelm, a lawyer, risked his professional reputation to defend one hundred of the academic participants in the revolt of 1848. Hence, the Rauschenbusch family had a liberal strain running through it along with the pietistic origins.[1]

---

[1] Blake McKelvery, "Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester," Rochester History, XIV, No. 4, 1.

[2] Sharpe, op. cit. pp. 21-22.

The Forty-Eighters, a recent book edited by A. E. Zucker, vividly describes the stream of refugees from the revolution of 1848. August Rauschenbusch and his son Walter, Carl Schurz and H. L. Mencken are symbols of the different parties in this contingent. August and then more clearly Walter Rauschenbusch represent the attempt to express the passion for democracy in the context of the Christian faith. Carl Schurz represents the same democratic faith expressed through political action in a secular-idealistic context. H. L. Mencken symbolizes the German freethinker with literary and intellectual gifts. (Mencken graduated from Knapp's Institute in Baltimore, a school founded by one of the Forty-eighters.)

The Forty-eighters were anti-ecclesiastical and secular because of bitter experiences with the reactionary state church of Germany. Moreover, they were deeply effected by the Enlightenment. The common creed was an impassioned faith in liberty, democracy and national unity in terms of an optimistic, rationalistic, progressivism. In America it immediately registered through a touching faith in humanity and democratic institutions.[1]

While some of these refugees found the more democratic churches of America a real alternative to the hidebound ecclesiasticism of Europe, the real expression of German Protestant progressivism was imminent in the continous waves of immigration other than the one solely from the 1848 upheaval. In the chapter on pietism this has been described. It led, for example, to the union of pietism and ecumenical liberalism in the Evangelischer Kirchenverein des Westens, the Evangelical Church Society of the West leading to the outlook represented by the Niebuhr family of Missouri and its subsequently famous sons, Reinhold and Helmut Richard.[2]

---

[1] A. E. Zucker, ed., The Forty-Eighters, Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848 (New York: Columbus University Press, 1950).

[2] Gelzer, op. cit. describes this in detail.

Therefore, Walter Rauschenbusch had a legacy of both political progressivism and rationalism through the unusually crucial time of his father's nurture and departure from Germany. His father was a part of the most liberal German contingent ever to come to America!

In addition, there is the suggestion of Ritschl concerning the tendency toward political liberty in Württemburg pietism.[1] We cannot pursue this further but it may be a clue to the receptivity of a genuine pietistic family of that area for political liberalism.

Another factor in the background of the Rauschenbusch family is his pattern of cultural development under a regimen of travel, encounter with beauty through travel and the fine arts, a classical education in the Continental manner with modern and classical languages, a background of brilliant intellectual life rooted in three of four generations of family eminence and the stimulus of knowing America and Europe almost equally well from childhood through maturity.

2. Rochester, New York, as a seed plot of liberalism

Rochester was and is a vital middle-sized city where liberal and social gospel thought came early and vigorous. The subsequent summary documents the sweep of this liberalism from the early years of his career where it is most likely to be an originating force to the mature years where Rauschenbusch was one of the acknowledged leaders of Rochester liberalism.

Walter Rauschenbusch was born in Rochester in 1861. The quotation on the next page from McKelvey dates the open defense of evolution by a local minister in the 1870's. This fact set forth by McKelvey means that Rauschenbusch grew up in a city where the most controversial liberal ideas were being promulgated from the very start of his life. There are many places in America where the son of a Baptist minister born in 1861 would not have been in any meaningful communication with such a liberal milieu.

---

[1] Ritschl, op. cit., pp. 3-159.

McKelvey reveals the fact that in the early part of his career Rauschenbusch was overshadowed by "several more dramatic prophets of the new day who were already on the scene":

> Indeed, the religious life of Rochester was kept in a state of constant turmoil for several decades by a succession of dynamic personalities. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the city's growing social problems and its re-actions to evolutionary doctrine and to the concepts of social Christianity which reached it from the outside found expression in a succession of pastors beginning with Reverend Newton M. Mann, defender of evolution in the 1870's and culminating with the Reverend Paul Moore Strayer, close associate of Rauschenbusch at the end of the period.[1]

By way of summary, Rochester developed the following striking trends and colorful personalities:

(a) In 1880 the Rochester Presbytery ejected the Plymouth church led by Myron Adams. Later the church was converted into a people's club house. Billiard and pool tables were installed in the former Sunday School rooms, dancing and other entertainment was offered. Lectures on social problems alternated with musicals to displace Sunday worship. A weekly paper, Here and Now was published.

Rauschenbusch was keenly interested in this ecperiment in social Christianity and appeared on its forum platform along with Richard T. Ely, Henry Demarest Lloyd, Golden Rule Jones and others. In 1902 the pastor resigned to become a Socialist organizer in New England.

(b) Dr. Algernon Crapsey organized the St. Andrews Episcopal church as a haven for the poor and the oppressed. In 1904 Crapsey started a series of lecture-sermons on the relation of religion to the state down through the ages. The tenth lecture brought him to a denunciation of the contemporary commercialization of both the church and the state--a theme Rauschenbusch had previously lectured upon. But in the next lecture he doubted the credibility of the virgin birth. In 1906 the Bishop removed him from St. Andrews, Crapsey started a series of lectures in a local theatre which were immensely popular, all dealing with the church and the social problem. Crapsey and Rauschenbusch were close friends, yet Rauschenbusch faced the wrath of Crapsey during the first World War era when he attacked him for being a non-interventionist.

---

[1] McKelvey, ibid., p. 3.

(c) Rauschenbusch lectured at all the liberal forums but especially at the Labor Lyceum started in 1896 as a Sunday afternoon discussion group devoted to questions of interest to working people. Actually, Rauschenbusch was more than a lecturer, he was one of the committee members. The scheduled topics ranged from God and the Bible (with contrasting views from total agnostics to devout believers) through temperance, peace, socialism, the class struggle and anarchism.

It was in the Labor Lyceum where Rauschenbusch frequently discussed the socialist question, meeting all comers. He candidly and openly criticized the dogmatic, brittle mentality of the socialists as something which would corrode the very genius of socialism.

At this point McKelvey makes a suggestion hitherto concealed as a possible explanation for the writing of Christianity and the Social Crisis. He believes that the Rochester Labor Lyceum was the anvil on which Rauschenbusch hammered out his social ethics, ultimately gaining expression in the book which made him famous.

(d) In 1901 Rauschenbusch was a member of a committee to draw up a chater for the local federation of churches. His committee recommended that the word "evangelical" be omitted in order not to exclude the Jews and Unitarians. The committee was not able to win the debate which this provoked but it suggests the liberal temper of Rauschenbusch.

(e) In 1904 a local branch of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom was organized, drawing together the socially minded local ministers. Annual meetings of the local chapter brought in nationally known speakers like Dr. Josiah Strong of New York on a theological platform which was a carbon copy of that which Rauschenbusch spelled out in his books.

(f) The institutional church movement was strong in Rochester with the Brick Presbyterian organized in 1898 and the Unitarian church of William C. Gannett taking the lead in 1901 when Dr. Gannett came to Rochester.

(g) In addition to institutional churches, there were creative offshoots of the church such as the Salvation Army organized in 1896, the Baden Street Settlement of 1901, the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A., established earlier, and a growing number of social agencies which attained the number of thirty-nine with a United Charities organization in 1910.

(h) There were numerous reform movements such as Clinton Howard's Prohibition Union, suffragist Political Equality Club and a special investigation committee set up by the Y. M. C. A. of which Rauschenbusch was the chairman. Its assignment was to investigate social conditions in Rochester. Twelve months were consumed in this study. Among other things this study revealed that the average wage in manufacturing was $498 a year for men and $267 for women. Twelve recommendations were made by Rauschenbusch's committee, all far-seeing and progressive.

(i) Along with liberal thought and action Rochester had a great revival in 1907 led by Wilbur Chapman with 200,000 attending two-hundred meetings.

What emerges here is a remarkable community giving a liberal social prophet a superb local base for leadership, expression of convictions, give and take with other people with social concerns and, above all, an opportunity for continuous lecturing well to the left of the conventional church meeting. The latter surely meant very much to the intellectual development of Rauschenbusch, giving his beliefs a testing not available under either crushing opposition or naive lack of concern. In Rochester he was a close friend of many unorthodox fellow Christians. In Rochester he lived when virtually every major social and religious agency came to birth. In Rochester he saw modern industrialism, immigration, labor, sex, and other acute problems come to the front for real attention. How many other cities in the United States would have lent so much encouragement to a non-conformist like him? Yes, Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester was part of his development. As a final point it should be observed that Rochester gave Rauschenbusch excellent coverage in the local press. Most of his major local addresses, whether at the opening of the Seminary or a Thanksgiving service at the Brick church were given the sort of coverage which today is accorded only to an occasional address by the head of state.

3. The New York Pastorate, 1886-1897

(a) In New York City Rauschenbusch's individualistic pietism broke down under the pathological collectivism of the city. "Clean, kindly, religious men," he wrote, "Stoop to methods so tricky, hard and rapacious, that we stand aghast whenever the curtain is drawn aside and we are shown the inside facts. . . . Men do not want to do these things; but in a given situation they have to, if they want to survice or prosper, and the sum of these crooked actions give an evil turn to their life."[1]

(b) In New York Rauschenbusch discovered political action and the beginnings of a basically socialist institutional criticism through Henry George, leading to his initial systematic reflections in the paper of December 12, 1887. This suggested that no amount of personal integrity and no amount of willy-nilly reform could deliver New York or the United States from the death pallor of capitalism and industrialism.

(c) In New York Rauschenbusch discovered a new kind of Christian co-worker in Leighton Williams and Nathanial Schmidt, leading to the Brotherhood of the Kingdom and the more regular give and take on social questions in a new theological context. Yet the fact that all these men started from a Baptist base started this journey on familiar ground. Also, the Brotherhood of the Kingdom opened up his great gifts in social analysis and criticism and gave him a literary medium in so doing.

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 264.

(d) Seven years after coming to New York he married Pauline Rothe of Milwaukee who shared his new theological and social views. A home was created which undergirded his prophetic life with support and understanding.

(e) One year before leaving New York for the Rochester position, he lost his hearing. This increased his sympathy for people with physical handicaps and, in general, this deafness likely intensified his scholarly career since reading was more functional.

(f) In New York Rauschenbusch discovered a completely new range of reading, utilized in structuring his new social passion with materials other than those found in Henry George, Richard Heath, Emile de Laveleye, Tolstoy, Mazzini, Ruskin, Sabatier, Ragaz, Kingsley, Maurice, Bellamy, Gladden and many others. The reading which was started in New York led to the systematic formulation of his Rochester books.

(g) During the New York pastorate Rauschenbusch took one of his most influential European trips to study sociology and the teachings of Jesus in Germany, and to inspect cooperatives, the Salvation Army and other social institutions in England while discussing Fabian socialism in the home of Sidney and Beatrice Webb.

(h) During the New York pastorate Rauschenbusch had his baptism of fire with a strike where he opposed the sadistic sentiments of Reverend A. J. Behrends who used the sanctions of the church against the workers.

The family roots in the German liberal revolution of 1848, the American re-location in Rochester where liberalism flourished quite early and the sharp intellectual, and the religious and social impact of New York City were surely basic to his development as a leader of the social gospel. Indeed, it was Rauschenbusch's historical destiny to be in various places where vigorous historical destiny forces were starting, rising, beginning and originating. In Germany, he experienced the early confident conquering phase of Ritschlianism; in America he entered the same early phase of liberal theology and social concern, and more specifically, in New York City and Rochester he had access to liberalism through movements, books, personalities, organizations, close friends and purgative critics. In giving a leader a firm grasp of a dynamic Zeitgeist nothing can equal direct encounter in key centers of influence during the earliest phases. This Walter Rauschenbusch experienced. When this interacted with his Christian convictions and his great personal gifts, the American social gospel received its definitive expression.

Part One: The Liberal Theologians, Biblical Scholars and Historians

A. Liberal Philosophers and Theologians

Much of the theological side of Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God ethics comes from Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl in an ascending scale of influence. As usual he presides over his mentors and is not slavishly committed to them. It is characteristic of Rauschenbusch to show this freedom. Yet there is a sense in which these three towering figures of German thought make everything else a commentary upon them.

His pietism no doubt helped prepare the way for men who were emphasizing experience, rejecting Protestant scholastic theology and using the scientific methods of historical and literary criticism. Walter's father entered Berlin University in 1834 at the age of eighteen thus bringing to this father-and-son team an early encounter with Kant and Schleiermacher. The latter died in Berlin in 1834 but his fame and his books were surely known at the time of his death. Ritschl's career as thinker had not started since he was only twelve in 1834. Walter himself entered the Symnasium at Gütersloh in 1879. This was follower by Berlin in 1883 where Kant, Schleiermächer and Ritschl were available through Mommsen and Curtius and others.

1. Immanuel Kant

Immanuel Kant, like Rauschenbusch was a child of pietism who turned to liberalism—at least in theology. He reacted against the rigid pietism of the school, Collegium Fridericianum, which he attended, 1732-1740.

From pietism Kant received an emphasis on the practical and moral priorities of religion. Yet Kant waged a battle against pietistic religious emotion, rejecting singing and praying starting with his early days as a university student. From the Enlightenment he received his rationalism, not so much as historical and empirical quest, as a metaphysical and universal outlook. Indeed, there is a distrust of history as a vehicle of truth. Thus, Kant grounds religious faith on our inmost moral consciousness. It is "essentially a religion of good works, in which virtue is loved for its own sake—a religion of pure humanity which is the true religion of Christ."[1]

Rauschenbusch believed that "the eighteenth century marked the adolescence of the modern spirit."[2] In this era science found itself developing a concept of knowledge which became a highway for the nations. Democracy and the rights of man were in the _Zeitgeist_. Intellectually, the historical method was becoming dominant. The original intention of the Reformation was coming to light. Then, Rauschenbusch points out:

> Philosophic minds like Leibniz, Herder and Kant looked backward and forward over the history and destiny of humanity with a broad sweep of comprehension. They no longer confined the saving work of God to Israel

---

[1] Immanuel Kant, _Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone_, translation and introduction by Theodore M. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1934), p. xxii.

[2] _Christianizing the Social Order_, p. 88.

> or the church, but saw Christ educating all mankind by all the varied agencies of human institutions.
>
> To such men the idea of the Kingdom of God offered itself as the only religious conception capacious enough for thoughts so large, for the Kingdom is an idea as broad as mankind, as inclusive as life itself, and as Christian as the Gospel. The lofty mind of Immanuel Kant was inspired with a religious enthusiasm by contemplating the possibility of an ethical common-wealth, a kingdom of virtue, in which right action would not, as in the State, be due to coercion, but to the free devotion of all. He held that in the past the upward aspirations of the individual have been corrupted or checked by the influence of society, which was a social force dominated by evil; therefore, a new organization of society is needed, consciously dedicated to righteousness, which will support and train the weak will of the individual. Such a Kingdom of God would be at once the highest good and the highest duty.[1]

Rauschenbusch's footnote for this exposition of Kant refers the reader to Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der Blossen Vernuft, especially Section III. The system which Kant expounds strikes many notes familiar to the Rauschenbusch system. It is a deism (with some theistic possibilities), a system of natural law[2] developed in terms of a collective, societal culmination in a Kingdom of God or Ethical Commonwealth. This Ethical Commonwealth is defined as "the concept of a people of God under ethical laws."[3]

The details of Kant's concept of the Kingdom in part III of his book on religion (the part recommended by Rauschenbusch) are as follows:

1. A juridico-civil state (Zustand or condition) of nature is the relation of men to each other in which they all stand alike under coercive public juridical laws.

2. An ethico-civil state of nature is that in which men are united under non-coercive laws, i. e., laws of virtue alone.

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, pp. 88-89.

[2] Compact definitions of natural law are elusive. In this study we shall accept Max Rheinstein's definition in An Encyclopedia of Religion, p. 517 that natural law is that part of divine law that is known to man through reason. And it is that eternal law of nature which constituted the standard of evaluation of all man's moral law. It is often thought of as a sub-Christian standard of morality which all men can know without revelation.

[3] Immanuel Kant, op. cit., p. 90.

3. Mankind must leave the ethical state of nature to become a member of the Ethical Commonwealth or Kingdom because the juridical state of nature is one of war of every man against the other; and the ethical state of nature is one in which the good principle, which resides in each man, is continually attacked by the evil which is found in him and everyone else.

4. The people cannot be the source of good laws because the general will sets up external legal control whereas morality is inner. Hence, an ethical commonwealth can be thought of only as a people under divine commands, i. e., as a people of God and under the laws of virtue.

5. The idea of a people of God can only be realized (through human organization) in the form of a church. What Kant means by a church is primarily the total organization of humanity under the moral law in a universal society. He contrasts the historical-ecclesiastical church versus the pure religious faith of reason in a universal church. In an interesting passage he rejects most of the historical forms of the church including the sectarian:

> An ethical commonwealth, then, in the form of a church, i. e., as a mete *representative* of a city of God, really has, as regards its basic principles, nothing resembling a political constitution. For its constitution is neigher *monarchial* (under a pope or patriarch), nor *aristocratic* (under bishops and prelates) nor *democratic* (as of sectarian *illuminati*). It could best of all be likened to that of a household *(family)* under a common, though invisible moral Father, whose Holy Son, knowing His will and yet standing in blood relation with all members of the household, takes His place in making His will better known to them; these accordingly honor the Father in him and so enter with one another into a voluntary, and enduring union of hearts.[1]

Here, then, is familistic organization of humanity in a voluntary, universal community of moral law, which is to say, the Kingdom of God. Specific historical faiths are limited by space and time; yet, because of the weakness in human nature, these historical faiths will persist. The ideal remains as the pure religious faith in the universal church. *The gradual transition of ecclesiastical faith to the exclusive sovereignity of pure religious faith is the* coming of the Kingdom of God.[1] In this transition worships sinks into the background since worship contains no moral worth; indeed, it is something which an evil man can perform. Moral faith assumes the predominant role. The atonement (what man cannot accomplish for himself) also sinks into the background:

---

[1] Immanuel Kant, *ibid.*, p. 93.

> Ecclesiastical faith, being historical, rightly starts with the belief in atonement; but since it merely constitutes the vehicle for pure religious faith (in which lies the real end), the maxim of action, which in religious faith (being practical) is the condition, must take the lead, and the maxim of knowledge or theoretical faith, must merely bring about the strengthening and consummation of the maxim of action.[2]

Moreover, the humiliating distinction between laity and clergy disappears because there will be equality arising from true freedom.

In addition, Kant believes that whereas morality has been expounded according to the Bible, it is better that the Bible be expounded according to morality.[3]

The final conclusion is that:

> We have good reason to say, however, that 'the kingdom of God is come unto us' once the principle of the gradual transition of ecclesiastical faith to the universal religion of reason, and so to a (divine) ethical state on earth, has become general and has also gained a public foothold, though the actual establishment of this state is still infinitely removed from us. For since this principle contains the basis for a continual approach towards such a consummation, there lies in it invisibly as in a seed which is self-developing and in due time self-fertilizing, the whole, which one day is to illumine and to rule the world.[4]

Lest there be any mistake that this is radically moralistic, Kant's last line in Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone declares that "the right course is not to go from grace to virtue but rather progress from virtue to pardoning grace."[5]

Thus we have outlined the particular part of Kant which Rauschenbusch himself recommended. What are the similarities and the differences?

The similarities are these:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 105. [2] Ibid., p. 109. [3] Ibid., p. 101.

[4] Ibid., p. 113. [5] Ibid., p. 190.

First, both conceive the Kingdom as the gradual triumph of moral values among mankind as a whole.

Second, both have the desire to purge Christianity of all irrational elements, pushing back to the rational essence of religion.

Third, both make redemption secondary to the coming of the Kingdom.

Fourth, both like the family as the ultimate symbol of human community.

Fifth, both have a sense of tension with this particular stage of religion and culture; yet both have a sense of consummation of the highest inner drives of the culture through religion.

Among the points of difference are these:

First, Kant's ultimate category is law and Rauschenbusch's ultimate category is love.

Second, Kant does not have any equivalent of Rauschenbusch's response to Jesus in terms of discipleship and apostolate.

Third, Kant broke quite radically with the church whereas Rauschenbusch was very much in the church all his life, utilizing its vocabulary and symbols despite a vigorous anti-ecclesiasticism spelled out in sectarian terms.

Fourth, Rauschenbusch has a much deeper interest in history and a much richer concept of historical forces than Immanuel Kant.

Fifth, Kant was a systematic philosophical thinker whereas Rauschenbusch was more topical and homiletical.

Sixth, Kant has no sociology of institutions commensurate with Rauschenbusch and particularly no sense of the creative role of gathered, intentential, democratic, Christian brotherhoods.

Nevertheless, we must conclude that the Enlightenment liberalism of Kant affected Rauschenbusch in the major concept of the Kingdom and in other emphases which we have outlined. Let us turn now to Schleiermacher, the bridge between Kant and Ritschl.

2. Friederich Schleiermacher

Rauschenbusch pays very high tribute to Schleiermacher. He quotes Pfleiderer approvingly where he says that "The Protestant theology of our age rests on the foundation laid by Schleiermacher; all theologians--some directly, some more indirectly--are seeking to establish connections between the religious personality of the individual and the common consciousness of the church."[1] Earlier Rauschenbusch had pointed out that "Schleiermacher was one of the really creative minds in the history of Protestant theology, a man who set new problems and made old problems profounder, thus fertilizing the thoughts even of those who know nothing of him."[2]

The Rochester social prophet quotes Ritschl to show that Schleiermacher should not be known primarily for his "subjective view of religion," the Gefühl or feeling of dependence on God as over against the rationalistic dogmatic theology or the dry intellectualism of the Enlightenment.[3] Rather, Schleiermacher ought to be known for his concept of solidarity. This concept as well as his Christology appear to have influenced Rauschenbusch the most.

The Yale lectures quote Der Christliche Glaube to show the racial and societal dimension of sin. Sin is something wholly common, not pertaining to every individual separately, but "in each the work of all in all the work of each."[4] Then Schleiermacher declares:

> In fact, we can understand it (sin) justly and completely only in this solidarity. For that reason the doctrines dealing with it are never to be taken as expressions of individual self-consciousness but they are expressions of the common consciousness. This solidarity is a unity of all places and all times. The peculiar form which this racial sinfulness takes in the individual, is simply an integral part of the form it takes in the social group to which he belongs, so that his sin is incomprehensible if taken alone and must always be taken in connection with the rest. This principle runs through all the concentric circles of solidaristic consciousness, through families, clans, tribes, nations, and races; the form which sin-

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 125. [2] Ibid., p. 92.

[3] Ibid., pp. 93-94. [4] Ibid., p. 93.

> fulness takes in any of these can be understood only in connection with the rest. Therefore, the total force exerted by the flesh against the spirit in all human actions incompatible with the consciousness of God, can be truly realized only when we see the totality of all contemporary life, never in any part alone. The same holds true of the succession of generations. The congenital sinfulness of one generation is conditioned by the sinfulness of those who preceded, and, in turn conditions the sin of those who follow.[1]

This quotation given here only in part is the longest single quotations in any of Rauschenbusch's volumes. This is likely true because the solidaristic view of sin and salvation is the very heart of his Kingdom theology and ethics. Schleiermacher developed and expanded the Kantian collectivism. This is the social dimension of the Christian faith modernized by solidaristic insights. This is not an Augustinian sense of guilt and inherent corruption but an incapacity for the good which is linked with the guilt of the race.

Redemption is the restoration of God-consciousness through Jesus Christ. Rauschenbusch clearly acknowledged his debt to Schleiermacher for this conception, too. According to Schleiermacher's view humanity in the Kingdom of God comes from a spiritual unity and fellowship with God. Christ was the first to live fully within the consciousness of God and share his holy and loving will. Thus, Christ set in motion a new beginning of spiritual power which pervades the common life within the organized totality of the race. Right here was the small start of the Kingdom of God within the race. Now the relation between God and humanity changes from antagonism to cooperation. This is not a forensic proposition but a new factor in the bloodstream of the race. Thus, "when men would learn to understand and love God; and when God could by anticipation see his own life appropriated by men, God and men would enter into spiritual solidarity, and this would be the only effective reconciliation."[2]

In this description of Schleiermacher's view of redemption one notes the weakening of forgiveness as a factor in redemption. Rather, there is the emphasis, as in Rauschenbusch, on the community or societal factor in redemption. In the church the social dimension and God-consciousness are available. Through them the individual passes from the evil state of God-forgetfulness to God-consciousness.

---

[1] *Ibid*. [2] *Ibid*., p. 265.

What are the agreements and the disagreements with Schleiermacher?

The first agreement is the conception of sin rooted in the social and racial oneness of mankind. This is the characteristic solidarity motif.

The second agreement is the emphasis upon religious experience rather than miracles, revelation or dogma.

Third, each man rejected forensic Christologies in favor of a concept whereby Divine-human solidarity is renewed through the new God-consciousness of Christ.

The differences are: first, Rauschenbusch believed that Schleiermacher was inconsistent in his analysis of redemption and of the Kingdom. At one time the redemptive theme was dominant and at another time the Kingdom theme was dominant. Rauschenbusch believed that the Kingdom must have priority at all times.

A second difference was that Schleiermacher lacked a full-orbed sociology despite the fact that Rauschenbusch believed that a sociological analysis was fully compatible with the Schleiermacher system. In fact, Rauschenbusch thought of himself as making the logical inference in ethics and sociology from the basic direction of Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl.

Third, Schleiermacher succumbed to German nationalism which, in actual fact, limited the basic integrity of his theology. Pinson's book, Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism concludes with a chapter on "Christian Patriotism" in which Schleiermacher's organismic view of the state strikes one as intensely nationalistic. He rejected a world-state; he accepted the monarchy; he identified the state with people and soil in the concept of Volksstaat. Rauschenbusch's life as the son of a German immigrant in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century made it easier for him to transcend these nationalistic beliefs. During the First World War Rauschenbusch was punished with real mental agony over the anti-German hysteria reigning at that time. While he loved German culture, he never succumbed even in part to an organismic view of the state.

3. Albrecht Ritschl

The most influential theologian for Walter Rauschenbusch was Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) who taught at Bonn and Gottingen. A comparison of the two men reveals that the similarities are very striking. Indeed, H. Richard Niebuhr places Rauschenbusch squarely with Ritschl, "though with greater moral force and less theological depth."[1] In other words, Rauschenbusch thought more clearly than Ritschl on ethical questions without possessing the theological insight of the man who was nonetheless regulative in his thinking. Niebuhr considers Ritschl, par excellence, the exemplar of the Christ of culture. It will be important to test these conception since it will shed much light on the same problem in Rauschenbusch.

Rauschenbusch pays high tribute to Ritschl. As early as 1892 he indicated that the sage of Gottingen had done the most effective work in making the Kingdom of God central in theology.[2] In his last book published in 1917--twenty-five years later--Rauschenbusch still maintained this prominent place for Ritschl, placing him at the top of an ascending scale of Kingdom theologians, namely, Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Kant is lauded for being the first to recognize the importance of the Kingdom of God for ethics. Schleiermacher was the first to apply the teleological quality of Christianity to definitions of its nature; yet Schleiermacher wavered ambigiously between personal redemption and the Kingdom of God. Therefore, Rauschenbusch concluded,[1] it was Ritschl who did more than anyone else to bring the Kingdom of God to the front in theology.

---

[1] H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

[2] Bodein, op. cit., p. 8.

To study the relation between Ritschl and Rauschenbusch is to observe the real impact of Ritschl on Rauschenbusch's ethics, particularly if we utilize the Kingdom of God outline to note precisely how the impact was made and how the origins in Ritschl made their influence felt.

Yet Rauschenbusch did not find his discipleship and apostolate in Ritschl. He rejected Ritschl's union of church and state and Ritschl's patriarchal monarchialism. He could not find a sociology in Ritschl and found this elsewhere in other and later liberal thinkers.

The comparison, however, of the Kingdom of God conceptions will bring to a specific focus how these two figures interacted with one another in _the_ master theme of the Kingdom of God.

1. The definition of the Kingdom of God

Here the earlier section revealed that Rauschenbusch defined the Kingdom as the Reign of God coming through the progressive growth of love in society leading to a humanity organized according to the will of God. In other words, it is a universal moral fellowship of humanity which comes gradually through the power of love.

There are many statements in Ritschl which could have suggested the precise definition of the Kingdom found in Rauschenbusch:

> The Kingdom. . . is the fellowship of moral action prompted by love.[2]
> Moral fellowship, viewed in these two characteristics of possessing the widest possible extension and being animated by the most comprehensive motive can only be conceived as the Kingdom of God. . . .Moral law is the system which embraces these dispositions, intentions, and actions

---

[1] _A Theology for the Social Gospel_, p. 139.

[2] Albrecht Ritschl, _op. cit_., p. 288.

> which necessarily follow from the all-comprehensive end of the Kingdom of God, and from the subjective motive of universal love.[1]

Consequently, to Ritschl the Kingdom is a universal moral fellowship motivated by love. It comes gradually as we shall see in the section on his philosophy of history. Thus, this definition of the Kingdom makes Rauschenbusch essentially a Ritschlian.

2. The role of the Kingdom

In Rauschenbusch the Kingdom is the master key to the mind of Christ and the most important material principle of the new theology.

Both of these statements concerning the role of the Kingdom are true for Ritschl also. However, with regard to the Kingdom as the master key to the mind of Christ, Garvie points out that Ritschl did not nail down this point without some development in his thought.[2] In his major work, Justification and Reconciliation, he first subordinates redemption to the Kingdom as the key to the work of Christ. Then he coordinates the two in his famous statement that "Christianity is not to be compared to a circle which should run about one centre, but to an ellipse, ruled by two foci."[3] Later he makes statements which make the foci identical. However, in Instruction in the Christian Religion the characteristic Ritschlian position is finally assumed: now the Kingdom of God is both the key to the mind of Christ and the regulative principle in his theology. Justification and Reconciliation was published 1870-1874 with the second edition in 1882-1883; Instruction was first published in 1875 with the second edition in 1881. Hence, the vacillation in the first volume was rather quickly corrected in the Instruction which followed only a year later.

In the Instruction Ritschl makes it quite clear how the Kingdom is the key to Christ:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 252. [2] Garvie, op. cit., p. 244.

[3] Ritschl, op. cit., III, 10-11.

> First, on the fact that He was the only one qualified for His special calling, the introduction of the Kingdom of God. . .
>
> Second, the work of Jesus Christ in His calling or the final purpose of His life, namely, the kingdom of God, is the very purpose of God in the world and is thus recognized by Christ himself. . .
>
> Third, Jesus Christ's prerogative, that the rulership of the world is delivered over to Him, answers to the solidaric unity of Jesus with the supramundane God in the realization of the supramundane kingdom of God, which as the final purpose of God is also the final purpose of the world.[1]

This clearly makes the kingdom the greatest fact about Christ and it is also the greatest fact for Christian community:

> The kingdom of God is the divinely vouched for highest good of the community founded through His revelation in Christ; but it is the highest good only in the sense that it forms at the same time the ethical ideal, for whose attainment members of the community bind themselves together through their definite reciprocal action.[2]

One must also note here in this conception of Ritschl a real tension between the kingdom and nature. What Ritschl accepts as given is "man's self-distinction from nature and his endeavor to maintain himself against it or over it."[3] In another key sentence, he says that "the kingdom of God, even as it now exists in the world as the present product of love-inspired action, is supra-mundane, in so far as we understand under mundane all natural, naturally conditioned and divided existence."[4] This, of course, will have a real bearing on the Christ-of-culture dimension of Ritschl's theology. In any case, the role of the kingdom is primary in both Rauschenbusch and Ritschl.

3. The response to the kingdom

In Rauschenbusch the response to the kingdom is discipleship and apostolate. He socialized discipleship in order to save it from an individualistic interpretation. His focus was usually on following Jesus but sometimes on union with the Holy Spirit in a more mystical fashion. He stressed the pure essence of the teaching of Jesus as the norm for the Christian life. He called for a broader definition of discipleship relevant to the new social movements outside of the church and he believed that a new social order would make it more possible to follow Jesus.

---

[1] A. T. Swing, Theology of Albrecht Ritschl which also includes Albrecht Ritschl's Instruction in the Christian Religion (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901) pp. 196-198.

[2] Ibid., p. 175.

[3] H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture, op. cit., p. 96.

[4] Ritschl, Instruction in the Christian Religion, op. cit., p. 179.

There are points of contact with Ritschl in this connection but there are also real differences. In Ritschl we also find the same emphasis on the historical Jesus and on the pure essence of his teachings, a rejection of Christological speculation regarding the two natures, and an emphasis on Christ's teleological mission rather than on His nature or origin. Moreover, Ritschl also sought to underscore the social dimensions of sin and redemption. Christ did not come to save individuals but to establish the Kingdom via community. Later we shall show that Ritschl did not have an adequate sociology as a logical inference from this socialized theology. Yet, the intensely social nature of his view of the work of the Christ is clear. For Ritschl the path from nature to Christ is through a moral faith interpreted within the experience of the Christian community.[1]

Ritschl's rather rigid historicism made him dissent from a direct spiritual contact with Christ in the present. Chapter VI in Justification and Reconciliation outlines his objections to the Christology of the Reformers. Ritschl was repulsed by the pietism which first mediated the Gospel to Rauschenbusch and within whose piety Rauschenbusch started his pilgrimage. Ritschl was the avowed enemy of all monastic and pietistic practices of the devotional life and of the separated life. Rauschenbusch corrected the subjectivity of pietism with a more objective and sociological concept of discipleship. And, moreover, Rauschenbusch had a more radical skepticism of the institutional church than Ritschl; hence he could not stress as bluntly as Ritschl that Christ cannot be known apart from his historical existence in the Christian community. On the other hand, Rauschenbusch transposed the force of this idea in accepting the kairos of his time through socialism and social movements where Christ was more truly present than in the church. Yet, he always hoped the church would respond to the Divine call to structure society with an analgous Christian democracy. Perhaps this is the real issue between them: For Rauschenbusch the response to Christ is both individual and social, the latter demanding socio-institutional action. For Ritschl the response to Christ demands Christian community but not radical social, political and economic changes.

---

[1] Daniel Day Williams, Constructive Theology (Class notes, University of Chicago, Oct. 22, 1949).

4. The function of the Kingdom

For Walter Rauschenbusch the function of the kingdom was to Christianize the social order by the abolition of unjust privilege while changing semi-Christian social institutions. This means that we must bring the social order into harmony with the ethical convictions that we identify with Christ. It was in the context of this idea that Rauschenbusch made his ill-fated attempt to measure the Christianization of our major institutions and then conclude that four (family, church, school and home) out of five major institutions were already essentially sound. In effect, the culture has realized itself through Christ and now there is only the economic order remaining for Christianization.

Again there are roots for this position in Ritschl but Rauschenbusch has displayed both his independence as well as his greater sociological and ethical depth in reconstructing his Ritschlian background.

In Ritschl, man comes into human culture with a drive toward the good but becomes corrupt through evil associations. These evil associations are mediated by society through social inheritance. Obviously, the creation of sound social relationships will make the difference in changing human life. To preach forgiveness of sins to individuals is to go back to the Old Testament or the Catholic perspectives. Forgiveness is always offered in terms of community.

Against this background, Rauschenbusch could easily develop his idea of Christianization, singling out the structural parts of the culture for clues as to their moral health. This would be an extension of Ritschl.

But, Ritschl also emphasizes the idea that in the Kingdom man realizes his highest good.[1] It is a self-realization theory predicated on the reality of freedom which one finds in the kingdom. Eternal life is given a present, historical definition. Eternal life is a quality of life for the present rather than a future state.

More than this is the concept, that the basic issue is between man and nature rather than between man and God. In applying this to nationality, for example, Ritschl displays that ability to rationalize nationality for which the German mind is so adept. He argues that Christianity must win over nations as a whole and that Christianity cannot be anti-national. He also proceeds to attack what he calls the pietistic critique of state churches (a critique which actually quite transcends the pietist fold, indeed, originated with the sectarians):

> One indeed hears from Pietistic circles precisely the opposite view, namely, that since the time of Constantine Christianity has been led into a path quite foreign to its nature, inasmuch as the end sought was no longer the conviction of individuals but the reception of whole nations into the Church. This result, then, having been attained by force, the peculiar conditions came into existence which had to be amended after so many centuries by the conversion of individuals as such. If, however, the nations are destined for Christianity as we may assume also in accordance with . . . Paul, the universal destination of Christianity is not impaired

---

[1] Albrecht Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation, translated by A. B. Macaulay and H. R. Mackintosh (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900), p. 200.

> by the fact that the members of a Christian nation do not all enter upon the destination which validly obtains for them.[1]

Thus Christianity is to win over nations as a whole. Thus, certain nations are destined for Christianity. What is more, Ritschl in the further development of his idea sees the diversity of nations due to different spiritual endowments as well as to acquired moral dispositions. The world-historical as over against the unhistorical (Australian negroes and Germany before the "wandering of the nations") and the particular-historical (China and India) lack an inner disposition toward Christianity. He does not deny a priori the possibility of extending the Christian community over nations that are not world-historical outside of Western civilization since scientific proof is not available. He implies, however, a skepticism about this possibility. The point is that he cannot conceive of any individual apart from nationality nor of any individual apart from the Christian community. Individualism is dead; collectivism is a fact. But the real point is that Christ seems to bring to fruition the cultural destiny of certain peoples but not necessarily of all peoples. Somehow, the rich historio-communalism of the culture meets the rich historio-communalism of the Christian faith and out of this comes what God has intended.[2]

Missing here, of course, is real tension and conflict between Christ and culture. One is moved to find the natural pattern which fits with the peculiar genius of Christianity. H. Richard Niebuhr observes that Ritschl's view sounds more like the gospel according to St. Immanuel than according to St. Matthew or St. Paul.[3] While Rauschenbusch had a love of German culture and a kind of deep Whitmanesque feeling for America's democratic destiny, he was not skirting the edges of enthnocentric nationalism. On the other hand, Rauschenbusch, while preserving a much sharper sense of tension with the culture, also tends to see Christ bringing to fruition the master cultural trends of our time such as an awakened working class seeking a socialist culmination to its hopes.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 135. [2] Ritschl, op. cit., pp. 133-138.

[3] H. Richard Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 100.

5. The Scope and location of the Kingdom

Rauschenbusch saw the kingdom as a universal socio-historical reality struggling with pietistic subjectivism, other-worldliness and apocalypticism, the latter three seeking to limit the scope of the kingdom or moving its location to a place beyond history.

Ritschl strikes much the same note. The Kingdom is a non-echatological historical reality. He attacked pietism with great vigor in his _Geschichte des Pietismus_. He defined eternal life as a quality of life available in the here and now. He set aside the eschatological passages of Scripture as either having spiritual meaning or as being unclear for the formulation of a theological doctrine. The Kingdom was founded by Jesus and exists today as a fundamental fact of human experience. _Now_ is the time!

6. The ethics of the kingdom

Rauschenbusch made one of the outstanding attempts in modern Christian history to construct an ethic of love. It was a view of love which makes society since love is the society-making ingredient, a love which relates us to society by causing the strong to stand with the weak, a love whose immediate task is to be socialized in the process of taming the economic order, a love which is superior to justice but which needs justice, and a love which views coercion as the symbol of its failure.

Already we have seen that Ritschl defined the Kingdom "as a fellowship of moral action prompted by love."[1] This is more than a chance remark. As regards God Ritschl declared:

---

[1] Albrecht Ritschl, _Justification and Reconciliation_, _op. cit_., p. 288.

> When God is convinced as love, through the relation of His will to His Son and the community of the Kingdom of God, He is not conceived as being anything apart from and prior to his self-determination as love. He is either conceived as love or not at all.[1]
>
> Thus, the goodness of God, as the general presupposition of everything is embraced in the specific attribute of the Divine Fatherhood; or, in other words, the truth that He has revealed himself to the Christian community as love.[2]

But Ritschl does not speak only to the nature of God as love, but also in relation to ethics:

> For if God is conceived in general as love in order to explain the Kingdom of God as the final end of the world and therefore the world itself, then, from the significance which the Kingdom has for God, there follows the content of the moral law and its absolute stringency for the members of the Kingdom. The practical union of a multitude of persons, so that as homogeneous with God they become the object of His will manifested as love, is effected by obedience to the law of love to God and our neighbor.[3]

Or again, Ritschl writes:

> Inasmuch as Jesus desired his own attitude to God to be shared by the rest of mankind, He laid upon his disciples, as their aim, also, the union of mankind through love, or, in other words the realization of the Kingdom of God.[4]

These quotations reveal the very real primacy of love in the thinking of Ritschl: God is love, there is the law of love, and the Kingdom is defined as a union of love. It is particularly important to see that the Kingdom is the correlate of love. Only in the Kingdom does God find an object truly commensurate with His love. All other attributes of God are attributes of love. This is true whether it is omnipotence, omniscence, omnipresence, or righteousness.[5]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 273.

[3] Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, *op. cit.*, p. 319-320.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 414.

[5] Ritschl, *Instruction in the Christian Religion*, *op. cit.*, p. 187-188.

Obviously, the law of love in correlation with the Kingdom is the very foundation of the Ritschlian system. To be sure, he does not elaborate its use as extensively as Rauschenbusch. But between the two men there is no essential difference. Ritschl once said, "He (God) is either conceived as love or not at all."[1] It is also accurate to say that for Ritschl and Rauschenbusch the Christian ethic is either conceived as love or not al all.

7. The sociology of the Kingdom

Rauschenbusch views life as operating in a solidaristic, socio-organic context in which sin expresses itself in super-personal social institutions bound together in the kingdom of evil. This kingdom is to be countered with the kingdom of God which must deal with social groups in its pattern of salvation. As we have indicated here is virtually Rauschenbusch at his best in spelling out the sociology of the Christian faith.

Ritschl has a strong emphasis on teleology. Indeed, it is basic to his outlook and a pioneer conception which he ascribed to Schleiermacher. Sin is social. It is not a purely individual matter. He frames his view as follows:

> The subject of sin . . . is humanity as the sum of all individuals, in so far as the selfish action of each person, involving him as it does in illimitable interaction with all others, is directed in any degree whatsoever towards the opposite of good, and leads to the association of individuals in common evil. This definition, which is in the closest formal agreement with Schleiermacher transcends the dilemma which hovers between Pelagius and Augustine.[2]

The reference to Pelagius suggests that he only recognized the individual will as a form of sin. And that Augustine takes the subject of sin to be humanity as a natural species embodying the person of the original sinners, our first parents. Ritschl believes that his view fits better the facts of actual sins in the real context in which they arise and then interact and interlace with other sins. This is the precise foundation in theological terms which led to Rauschenbusch's elaboration and supplementation of the idea in sociological terms. Earlier Rauschenbusch had indicated that Ritschl was "born too early to get sociological ideas."[1]

---

[1] Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation, p. 282. [2] Ibid., p. 335.

8. The ecclesiology of the kingdom

The true church, Rauschenbusch believed, was a disciplined, democratic voluntary association which has a direct effect on social institutions; in making this impact the church realizes its sole reason for existence, namely, to serve the Kingdom.

It is at this point that the distance between Rauschenbusch and Ritschl is the greatest. Rauschenbusch did not borrow his doctrine of the church from Ritschl. This belongs much more clearly to the left-wing and, in part, to pietism.

Two cornerstones are apparent in the Ritschlian view of the church. First, he distinguishes between moral and devotional life, a distinction which is based on the larger difference between the church and the Kingdom. The Community of believers constitutes the church when it is engaged in public worship or devotional action; the Community of believers constitutes the Kingdom of God when its members are acting morally toward each other in everyday life.[2] Thus the Kingdom is given a purely moral definition separated from sacraments and piety.

Second, the Kingdom is identified with the invisible church. The church is visible to the naked eye. The church belongs to the world. The kingdom, though moral, is supra-mundane. In a typical utterance, he says:

> A legally constituted church, be it Catholic or Lutheran, is not the kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Christ, for the simple reason that the

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel, op. cit., p. 139.

[2] Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation, p. 284f.

> Church is not the Kingdom of God. Activity of the most important kind for the service of the Church may be of no value whatever for the Kingdom of God. Nor is devotion to the Church a virtue which in any way could compensate for the absence of conscientiousness, justice, truthfulness, uprightness, tolerance.[1]

Yet these two spheres while different are related to one another. Garvie declares that, to Ritschl, they are mutually dependent and reciprocally serviceable.

Obviously, Ritschl is primarily interested in the relation of church to the kingdom and solves the problem by stripping the church of any dynamic function and giving to the kingdom the crucial moral assignment. Although few theologians have made corporateness more crucial for Christianity than Ritschl, nevertheless neither the Catholics nor the Reformers nor the sectarians will accept the formulation. Ritschl has constructed an independent status for ethics apart from the church. The latter exists in terms of piety but not in terms of ethics.

Rauschenbusch, on the other hand, shares the sense of tension between church and kingdom in making the church serve the kingdom. But, he does not want the church operative solely in terms of piety. The church is a democratic voluntary association whose pattern analgously effects social organization. Ritschl rejected all the current forms of church organization. Rauschenbusch accepted a modified version of the sectarian.

9. The philosophy of history of the Kingdom

Rauschenbusch believed that the Kingdom came by evolutionary gradualism and by distinct periodizations of which his day was one of the richest of all history.

In general Ritschl shares the gradualistic concept of the Kingdom's coming and growth. He has very little to say about the Christian hope. As indicated previously in point five of the Rauschenbusch-Ritschl comparison, he tended to believe that the New Testament either taught eternal life as a present state or that the New Testament was not really systematically clear on a doctrine of last things. In view of the fact that Charles Darwin and Albrecht Ritschl were contemporaries (Ritschl 1822-1889, Darwin 1809-1892) it is obvious that the impact of evolutionary gradualism would be more forceful on Rauschenbusch (1861-1918). As a matter of fact, it is paradoxical that Rauschenbusch preserved both a greater sense of evolutionary development, on the one hand, and a sense of crisis in cultural conflict on the other.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

[2] See page 175 for the definition of periodization used in this study.

With regard to periodization, there is nothing in Ritschl which quite equals what Rauschenbusch meant by this concept. To be sure, in the one-hundred years between himself and Kant, Ritschl is really a part of a great period of human development--the period of the Enlightenment.

4. Josiah Royce

Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl in an ascending scale of influence provide the major liberal contribution to the origins of Rauschenbusch's theology. The lengthy presentation of Ritschl's view on the Kingdom of God demonstrated the critical relationship which Rauschenbusch maintained even with his greatest liberal mentor in theology. His encounter with Ritschl is basic but critical.

After Ritschl other theologians have secondary roles. The impact is later and the contributions less structural. There is, on the other hand, evidence suggesting varying degrees of influence from the post-Ritschlians.

Josiah Royce is the most important of these secondary figures. His great teaching career at Harvard, 1882-1916 makes him a contemporary of Rauschenbusch's most creative years.

As an example of how Rauschenbusch views Royce we can turn to his Taylor lectures at Yale in 1917. He is dealing with the church. First he pays tribute to the contribution of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Then he rates Royce as the outstanding American thinker on the church in relation to salvation:

> In American thought the most striking utterance on the indispensible importance of the Church in salvation has come from an eminent outsider, a philosopher and not a theologian, Professor Royce. He had worked out 'the philosophy of loyalty' in other fields and then applied it to religion in 'The Problem of Christianity' (1913). This book is the mature product of his life, and its argument is evidently uplifted by the conviction that he had discovered some highly important facts.[1]

First, Professor Royce shows that humanity is divided into two different grades or levels: individuals and communities. He rates as the preeminent religious and moral truth "that a community, when unified by an active indwelling purpose is an entity more concrete and less mysterious than any individual man, and can love and be loved as a husband and wife love."[2] The term love is restricted to individual relationships. When an individual loves a community, the term loyalty is applied.

Second, Prof. Royce affirmed the burden of sin: "The individual human being is be nature subject to some overwhelming moral burdens, from which, if unaided, he can not escape. Both because of what has been technically called original sin, and because of the sins that he himself has committed, the individual is doomed to a spiritual ruin from which only a divine intervention can save him." He "cannot unaided win the true goal of life. Help must come to him from some source above his own level."[3]

Third, salvation comes not through the person Christ, but by membership in a community which has salvation. Thus one gives this community loyalty, identifying oneself with its life, appropriating its memories, experiences, hopes, spirit and faith. This is the atoning and saving power of the true Community and it is available in Christianity.[1]

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel, op. cit., pp. 125-126.

[2] Rauschenbusch, Ibid., p. 126. [3] Ibid., p. 127.

In the preface Professor Royce makes it quite clear that he is an explicit modernist. He bases it on the fact that the church rather than the person of the founder is viewed as the central idea of Christianity. Second, his is a religion of experience--not the religious experience of individuals as in William James's Varieties of Religious Experience (to whom Royce said he owed a great inspiration) but rather social religious experience. This social experience is that upon which loyalty depends. His most severe criticism of James is the belief of his that the religious experience of a church must be "conventional," a "profound and a momentous error."[2]

Rauschenbusch is pleased with Royce's basic argument but vigorously rejects "the slighting of Jesus" as one of the most unsatisfactory elements in Royce's thought. Indeed, Rauschenbusch declares that "a proper evaluation of Jesus as the initiator would have been the natural and necessary consummation of this entire doctrine of salvation by loyalty."[3] (Italics mine.) Rauschenbusch makes much of his Christocentric critique:

> If the Church is to have saving power, it must embody Christ. He is the revolutionary force within it. The saving qualities of the Church depend on the question whether it has translated the personal life of Jesus Christ into the social life of the group and thus brings it to bear on the individual. If Christ is not in the Church, how does it differ from 'the world?' It will assimilate its members, but it will not make them persons bearing the family likeness of the first-born son of God.[4]

Apparently, Rauschenbusch would add the point that Jesus as the initiator of the saving and atoning community is a natural consummation of the whole Roycian argument. It is not an attack on Royce's modernism or on his social dimension to salvation. It is an argument over the source of the Beloved Community's vitality and over the origin of its existence. Hence, Rauschenbusch presents what one might call an evangelical modernism, a term used by C. J. Cadoux some years ago.[1] But, Rauschenbusch's deep sympathy for a modernistic absolute idealist such as Royce is significant and, basically, in line with the Kantian-Schleiermacher-Ritschlian Enlightenment continuum. Royce comes more through Hegel than Kant even though Royce objected to a glib use of Hegelianism as characteristic of his position if this ignored the contribution of Charles Peirce, William James and even Schopenhauer.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 127.

[2] Josiah Royce, The Problem of Christianity (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913), I, xv-xvi, xxl.

[3] Rauschenbusch, op. cit., p. 127. [4] Ibid.

5. Washington Gladden, Henry Churchill King, G. B. Smith, William N. Clarke and William Adams Brown

The American theologians known and read by Rauschenbusch were all essentially Ritschlians who contributed nothing new to his thought. They did confirm the general trend of his theology and perhaps tightened the connection between theology and the emerging social gospel.

In Christianizing the Social Order (1912) Rauschenbusch writes:

> I want to pay the tribute of honor to three men who were pioneers of Christian social thought in American twenty-five years ago: Washington Gladden, Josiah Strong and Richard T. Ely. These men had matured their thought when the rest of us were young men, and they had a spirit in them which kindled and compelled us.[3]

Of these three men only Gladden would qualify as a more systematic theological thinker even though Gladden was essentially a preacher with definite literary gifts. Gladden's theology, as Charles Howard Hopkins points out, stemmed directly from Horace Bushnell.[4] The similarities between Ritschl and Bushnell are very striking. This was first pointed out in 1902 by Professor George B. Stevens.[1] Frank Hugh Foster also made this same point in his History of New England Theology, arguing that both were alike in their point of departure, in detailed results and in a common reaction against a repulsive orthodoxy.[2] The only difference was that Ritschl was the scholar and Bushnell the pastor-poet. Foster, incidentally, insists that Bushnell was the greater man! Thus there is a line from Ritschl to Rauschenbusch. It is a line with variations but it mediated the Ritschlian theological themes rather clearly.

---

[1] C. J. Cadoux, The Case for Evangelical Modernism (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1939).

[2] Royce, op. cit., pp. xi-xii. [3] P. 9.

[4] Charles Howard Hopkins, op. cit., p. 5. Bushnell broke down the old individualism, made experience central, lessened supernaturalism and set Christ in the center.

Rauschenbusch both quotes and recommends other American Ritschlians: William Newton Clarke's Outline of Christian Theology;[3] William Adams Brown's Christian Theology in Outline;[4] Gerald B. Smith's Social Idealism and the Changing Theology;[5] Henry Churchill King's Reconstruction in Theology.[6] As previously noted there is nothing really new in these books which Rauschenbusch had not already found and amplified in Ritschl. However, these American Ritschlians could, of course, be recommended to his American readers since their books were in English and generally more adjusted to the American mind.

All the familiar themes are here: the Kingdom as the master theme, the community as the religious unit, religious experience more valuable than doctrine, the growing social consciousness, value-judgments as the source of knowledge, playing down the miraculous, little interest in the Trinity and the Incarnation, a sympathy for science and the new sociology and an optimistic view of man and history.

---

[1] American Journal of Theology, Jan., 1902.

[2] Frank Hugh Foster, History of New England Theology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907), p. 412. Bushnell's theology was liberal but his ethics were those of a Tory. He thought it was against the will of God to interfere in any way with the operation of economic law.

[3] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 61. [4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 5. [6] Ibid., p. 13.

Rauschenbusch's legacy from the Enlightenment mediated by Christian Ritschlian theologians is basic and real.

B. Liberal Biblical Scholars

Walter Rauschenbusch was a bi-lingual first generation German-American. He was educated in America at Rochester university and seminary. In Germany he attended gymnasium and two periods of university. Hence; he was always keenly informed on scholarly trends in Europe, particularly in Germany.

Against this background, Rauschenbusch followed the major trends in Biblical criticism as a child of the times. It was not a dutiful following of the current "line" in Biblical criticism but a joyous sense of having discovered a new truth with a great contribution to the social message of the Christian faith. In his outburst of delight in the rich new period of history which is realizing the Renaissance, the Reformation and the prophetic expectation, he notes that the Bible shares in the new social interpretation.[1]

In studying the relation of Biblical scholars to the origins of his ethics there are several impressions. First it appears that the Biblical scholars are well known to him. (His field was New Testament in the German seminary prior to taking the church history chair in the English school.) A second impression is that the Biblical scholars do not register as heavily on his thinking as the theologians, the historians and the socio-economic thinkers. The references are less. The impact seems to be less. The basis for proving impact is also less than in the case of the theologians.

The following passage indicates the zest with which he welcomed the new approach to the Bible:

> The first scientific life of Christ was written in 1829 by Karl Hase.

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, op. cit., p. 45. The first three chapters of this book provide the definitive expression of his Biblical views.

> Christians had always bowed in worship before their Master, but they had never undertaken to understand his life in its own historical environment and his teachings in the sense in which Jesus meant them to be understood by his hearers. He had stood like one of his pictures in Byzantine art, splendid against its background of gold but unreal and unhuman. Slowly, and still with many uncertainties in detail, his figure is coming out of the past to meet us. He has begun to talk to us as he did to his Galilean friends, and the better we know Jesus, the more social do his thoughts and aims become.[1]

Even more specifically, Rauschenbusch found the main themes of his theology in Biblical criticism: the centrality of the Kingdom to Jesus, the central ethical concern of the prophets of whom Jesus was the chief, evolutionary development from lower to higher forms and Pauline and Johannine elements as Hellenistic accretions on the simple teachings of Jesus.

Consider, now, more specifically some of the scholars who influenced him.

1. Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918)

Wellhausen is one of many German scholars quoted by Rauschenbusch. In one of the passages where he is mentioned Rauschenbusch has been showing that Jesus appropriated the essential spirit of the prophets. And that "in the poise and calm of his mind and manner, and in the love of his heart, he was infinitely above them all."[2] In his footnote appended to this statement Rauschenbusch declares that "this superiority is beautifully expressed in Wellhausen's 'Israelitische and Judische Geschichte,' Chapter XXIV." One is accustomed to think of Wellhausen more in terms of Old Testament criticism, yet he actually did most of his writing on New Testament themes. He wrote the aforementioned volume about the time Rauschenbusch first entered German universities with the third edition published in 1897.

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, ibid., p. 46. Karl August Hase of Jena, 1800-1890, belonged to what Schweitzer calls the last phase of rationalism. Miracles are explained. The resurrection may have taken place after a return to consciousness. He surrenders the birth stories and the "legends of childhood." The life of Jesus is divided into two periods: the first when he accepted the prevailing Messianic ideas; the second when he formulated his own. John alone avoids the eschatological errors of the first period. Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1945), pp. 58-62.

[2] Ibid., p. 53.

The book which Rauschenbusch particularly singles out by Wellhausen, Israelitische und Judische Geschichte, could find no better summary than the words of Albert Schweitzer:

> . . . it gives a picture of Jesus which lifts Him out of the Jewish frame altogether. The Kingdom which He desires to found becomes a present spiritual entity. To the Jewish eschatology His preaching stands in a quite external relation, for what was in His mind was rather a fellowship of spiritual men engaged in seeking a higher righteousness. He did not really desire to be a Messiah, and in His inmost heart had renounced the hopes of His people. If He called Himself Messiah, it was in view of a higher Messianic ideal. For the people the acceptance of the Messiahship denoted the supersession of their own very differently colored expectation. The transcendental events become immanent. In regard to the apocalyptic Judgment of the World, he retains only the sermon preserved by John about the inward and constant process of separation.[1]

Obviously, this approach is very characteristic of Rauschenbusch: the Kingdom is a present spiritual entity outside the context of the apocalyptic, leading to a fellowship of spiritual men seeking a higher righteousness.

Before leaving Wellhausen and turning to several Americans recommended by Rauschenbusch, it will be helpful to list some of the other European scholars quoted in the works of Rauschenbusch:

1. Ernest Renan, La Vie De Jesus (Paris, 1863)[2]
2. Emil Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (1886)[3]
3. Emil Friedrich Kautzsch, Geschichte des altestamentliches Schriftens[4]
4. Karl Agust von Hase, Das Leben Jesu, (1829)[5]
5. Williband Beyschlag, Das Leben-Jesu (1885)[6]

---

[1] Albert Schweitzer, ibid., pp. 254-255.

[2] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 52.

[3] Ibid., p. 108. [4] Ibid., p. 11, 21.

[5] Ibid., p. 46. [6] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 67.

6. Otto Pfleiderer, Grundriss der christlichen Glaubenslehre (1903)[1]

7. Abraham Kuenen, Prophets and Prophecy in Israel (1874)[2]

8. Alfred Edershein, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (1883)[3]

9. B. Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament (1884)[4]

10. Dobschutz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church[5]

11. Karl Heinrich Weiszacker, History of the Apostolic Age (1864)[6]

In scanning this list there is no one here who fundamentally alters the picture received from Wellhausen. Quite definitely there are two major absentees whose presence would have altered the basic orientation of Rauschenbusch's Biblical outlook and whose position would have protected the Rauschenbusch Weltanschaung from severe attacks later on. I refer to Johannes Weiss whose Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes was first published in 1892 (the very year of Rauschenbusch's first cycle of study in Germany at the university level); and Albert Schweitzer whose Von Reimarus zu Wrede or The Quest of the Historical Jesus was published in 1906 one year before Rauschenbusch's second stint in Germany but very likely after he had written Christianity and the Social Crisis, published in 1907.

Johannes Weiss's life, 1863-1914, very closely parallels that of Walter Rauschenbusch, 1861-1918. Obviously, Rauschenbusch was two years older than Weiss. Since the consistent eschatology of Weiss was written in 1892 it surely must have been known to one so thorough in his reading as Rauschenbusch.[7]

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 225.

[2] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 38.

[3] The Social Principles of Jesus, p. 140.

[4] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 104.

[5] Ibid., p. 118. [6] Ibid., p. 100.

[7] Albert Schweitzer believes that Weiss's book is "one of the most important books in historical theology. It seems to break a spell. It closes one epoch and begins another." To explain its comparative lack of impact he suggests its brevity of sixty-seven pages and the fact that major theological

Fourteen years later came Schweitzer and, even then, Rauschenbusch still had twelve of his best years ahead of him. On the other hand, by the time Schweitzer's bomb exploded Rauschenbusch had set his mind on a view of history which he either could not or would not change.

A letter to the present writer by Conrad Henry Moehlman suggests that Rauschenbusch knew the attack on his position but would not yield. The eschatological conception would have meant a radical re-working of his entire theological, historical and ethical outlook in view of his tendency toward a developmental, gradualist, evolutionary view of life. In any case, the American zeitgeist was hardly in the mood for an outlook more akin to Melville, Kierkegaard, and Dostoievsky than to Emerson, Ritschl and Tolstoy!

Moehlman's letter, dated July 25, 1955, is as follows:

> The Schweitzer-Weiss Bousset revolution was not missed by Rauschenbusch. He had taught German for years at the German department, Rochester Theological Seminary, and had discovered the process view of the Kingdom of God. He had advocated it long before putting down his views in his first book. When Ed Steiner under his leadership had accepted the view and taught it in his classes in Grinnell, he one day made the discovery that no great German scholar agreed with it and wrote Rauschenbusch a long, bitter letter accusing him of leading him (Steiner) astray. Rauschenbusch let me read the letter in the old Rochester Theological Seminary and asked me whether I agreed with him or the 'German Neutestament.' I answered that he had no support for the process view. But this did not change his mind.[1]

This letter thus suggests that Rauschenbusch had read but had not heeded the new school which arose to challenge a position which started with Hermann Samuel Reimarus, 1694-1768, and his posthumously published Wolfenbuttel Fragments. This initial thrust of historicism and rationalism was climaxed in William Wrede's exposition of thoroughgoing skepticism, Das Messiasgehennis in den Evangelium, 1901. Schweitzer was aware of this agonizing conflict: thorough-

---

shifts take from one to two generations. The latter point likely suggests why Rauschenbusch simply could not get "inside" the Weiss-Schweitzer position. The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 238.

[1] Conrad H. Moehlman, personal letter, July 25, 1955.

going skepticism or thoroughgoing eschatology. Earlier Strauss laid down the gauntlet: either purely historical or purely supernatural. The Tubingen school declared: either Synoptic or Johannine. Now the issue, at best, was either eschatological or non-eschatological. Or, the issue was either thoroughly skeptical or consistently eschatological. This Continental feeling for a ghastly, agonizing dilemma with no mediating answer, may well have contributed to Rauschenbusch's rejection of New Testament eschatology as a lurid addition of the early church _to_ the mind of Jesus.

2. Shailer Mathews

Two American scholars are singled out by Rauschenbusch as the writers of books on the social aims of Jesus. For those who read only English he recommends the two "excellent" books: _Jesus Christ and the Social Question_ by Professor Francis G. Peabody of Harvard; and the _Social Teaching of Jesus_ by Shailer Mathews of Chicago. He rates Peabody as sympathetic in its treatment and Mathews as more incisive in his methods.

Let us consider Mathews first because he represents a shift which might have taken place in Rauschenbusch had he lived after the first World War instead of dying of cancer in 1918 at the age of fifty-seven.

Mathews's book was published in 1897 being a rewritten version of articles published in the _American Journal of Sociology_ then under the editorship of Albion W. Small. Mathews called his series, "Christian Sociology," uniting his interest in sociology and biblical theology. So far as he was aware this was the first volume in English in its field--although this is only accurate as regards the first presentation of the newer liberal conception of the Kingdom "as a social order to be progressively reached."[1] It is significant that thirty-one years later in 1928 he rewrote the book under the title _Jesus on_

---

[1] Shailer Mathews, _New Faith for Old, An Autobiography_ (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936), p. 120.

Social Institutions to incorporate an eschatological view of the Kingdom. Could this have happened to Rauschenbusch in the event he had lived for seventy-eight years like Mathews (1863-1941) instead of fifty-seven years (1861-1918)?

But let us look more closely at this book which Rauschenbusch recommended even more highly than that of Peabody's widely used book.

Mathews writes discriminatingly on the meaning of the Kingdom, being aware of the Scylla of literalism and the Charybdis of modernization of the simple records in the gospels. Mathews is clear that Jesus did not believe in a Kingdom which was political or theocratic as the Christian socialists believe. Nor does he accept the view that Jesus taught the Kingdom as a figure of speech merely to indicate a perfect method of life for the individual in the subjectivity which he finds in Tolstoy's The Kingdom of God is Within You. Likewise, Mathews rejects the eschatological view of the Kingdom as untenable. He does see much worth in this position, a worth eventually leading to a revision as we have shown, but in 1897 he thought the eschatological position was historically conditioned. Mathews believes he is left with these two facts: first, Jesus thought of the kingdom as a concrete reality rather than an idea; second, that this reality was not to be left as an unattainable ideal but was to be progressively realized, perhaps to be evolved.[1]

Therefore, how can we define the Kingdom to avoid error and yet conserve these two truths?

Mathews offers the following:

> By the kingdom of God Jesus mean an ideal (though progressively approximated) social order in which the relation of men to God is that of sons, and (therefore) to each other, that of brothers.[2]
>
> In a word, in the old social order, Jesus saw the tyranny of selfishness and hatred; in the new he sees a universal reign of love—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.[3]

---

[1] Shailer Mathews, The Social Teaching of Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897), pp. 40-53.

[2] Ibid., p. 54. [3] Ibid., p. 62.

> The method and the means by which the world is to be transformed into the kingdom do not concern us here. It is enough to point out the fact that the kingdom is thought of by Jesus as present as well as future, and that its history is an evolution. . .[1]
>
> Although this triumphant establishment of the ideal society is the goal of human evolution under the impulse of the newly revealed religious forces, Jesus does not allow himself to weaken the practical operation of an attempted realization of its laws by an over description of its joys.[2]

These quotations reveal once again the congenial soil of evolutionary idealism in which the social gospel took root. One is impressed by Mathews's attempt to protect his kind of idealism from glib optimism and from oversimplification. At every point he tried to secure the maximum protection from possible attacks on the position. Yet this is still the voice of a Christianized Enlightenment idealism rediscovering the Christian ethic. The intellectual honest of Mathews was, however, to force a serious modification of this outlook by 1928.

3. Francis G. Peabody

Francis Peabody presents with great erudition and definitive bibliography a social interpretation of Jesus published in 1900. There is nothing particularly new here even though the book is a commentary on the alertness and catholicity of American Protestantism fifty years ago as it responded to the social implications of Jesus.

According to Peabody Jesus is more than an economic reformer even though his sayings on wealth are very hard. Jesus issues a summons to the Kingdom and demands the whole life of the person in doing so.[3]

The mechanism of the social order is adapted for the conveyance of social energy. The teachings of Jesus will give us ample power to transmit energy.

The kingdom is gradually realized and is the finally perfected brother hood of all mankind.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 73. [2] Ibid., p. 75.

[3] Francis G. Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1900), p. 285.

In our time the socialist movement is of great significance. Jesus can contain the socialist program within his Kingdom yet the Kingdom is more than socialism.[1]

The learning of this book no doubt appealed to Rauschenbusch, especially its knowledge of the best in German scholarship. And, once again, his gradualistic, moralized view of the Kingdom was confirmed along with considerable emphasis on the economic factor in the growth of the Kingdom. Peabody was a idealist of the Ritschlian type.

This brief survey of the personalities and books in the Biblical field by focusing on Wellhausen, Mathews and Peabody plus passing reference to his many European mentors shows that Rauschenbusch's orientation here was one of liberalism, rationalism, historicism, skepticism and moralism. He existed in a most difficult transitional period in Biblical studies, arriving on the scene of creative scholarship and leadership just before major shifts brought about by archeology, historical agony, disillusionment with scientism and in all forms of naive optimism along with the recovery of the uniqueness of Biblical categories. Basically, Rauschenbusch's background was in the Enlightenment as regards the Bible. Yet he helped reveal ethical resources in Holy Scripture obscured by an orthodoxy without an adequate ethics or sociology.

C. Liberal Historians

Earlier we have seen how Richard Heath and Emil de Laveleye gave Rauschenbusch a sense of the crucial role of Christianity in history as a creative factor. Perhaps this was the most important aspect of his approach to history, a factor rooted in his sectarian background.

On the other hand, he was greatly influenced by one of Ritschl's most devoted followers, Adolph Harnack.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 287.

1. Adolph Harnack, 1851-1930

Harnack was ten years younger than Rauschenbusch and died twelve years after the latter had passed on. An avowed follower of Ritschl, Harnack is the most quoted author in Rauschenbusch's books and unquestionably gave Rauschenbusch his basic method for research in church history. The frequent references to Harnack are usually more than footnotes but rather acknowledgement of a much larger debt plus citations to whole sections of Harnack's works, especially, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries[1] originally published in 1906 as Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Rauschenbusch's Christianity and the Social Crisis has five major references to the above book. For example, in contrasting Jewish apocalypticism with the evolutionary, organic view he writes in the footnote: "In the following sections I am greatly indebted to Harnack, 'Expansion of Christianity,' Book II, Chapter VI."[2] On this same issue in his second book he urges the reader to "see the admirable article by Harnack on the 'Millennium' in the 'Encyclopedia Britannica.' "[3]

In discussing the relationship of the finances of the church to its constitution and inner life he refers the reader to an article by Harnack in the Contemporary Review, 1904, "The Relation Between Ecclesiastical and General History."[4]

To some extent Harnack employs the concept of analogy to find the reflected image of a given institution projected into the culture. But, instead of seeing the democratic sect projecting itself into a democratic culture Harnack invariably sees a pagan culture projecting its image on the church. Rauschenbusch, for example, quotes Harnack as saying that when the early church lost its vigor, the culture wrought itself into the church, hence, the Roman Catholic church is still the religious replica of the Roman imperial organization.[1]

---

[1] English edition, New York: Putnam, 1908.

[2] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 112.

[3] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 81.

[4] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 298.

Everything we have said thus far is less decisive than the declaration which the Rochester social prophet makes in his last book:

> *We shall not get away again from the central proposition of Harnack's History of Dogma, that the development of Catholic dogma was the process of the Hellenization of Christianity; in other words, that alien influences streamed into the religion of Jesus Christ and created a theology which he never taught nor intended. What would Jesus have said to the symbol of Chalcedon or the Athanasian Creed if they had been read to him?*[2]
> (Italics Mine)

Obviously, the perspective of Harnack opens the gates for a radical attack on previous theological formulations, both Catholic and Protestant--all of the former and most of the latter. It will help to explain one of Rauschenbusch's most restricting blunders, namely, his placing of social concern in Christian history as something basically contemporaneous except for the early church and the Reformation radicals.

It will also explain his vulnerability to the theology of the Enlightenment when one understands that with the methodology of Harnack most Christian doctrine is destroyed as null and void. Let us turn for a fuller look at the historical method which Rauschenbusch took from his fellow-Ritschlian, Adolph Harnack.

First, Harnack describes and rejects the classical Catholic dogmatic methodology: (a) the assumption of the divine origin of a succession of Christian and pre-Christian writings, and of an oral tradition; (b) the abstraction from these of propositions of faith logically formulated, expressed for scientific and apologetic purposes, and mutually connected, the contents of which are the knowledge of God, the world, and the divine provisions for salvation;

---

[1] *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 169. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

(c) the proclamation straightway of this structure (dogmas) as the content of Christianity, the believing acknowledgment of which must be required of every mature member of the Church and should be at the same time the condition of blessedness held in prospect by religion.[1] This outlines the source, the method and the religious value of dogma.

He then compares Protestants and Catholics on the source, method and value of dogma. Protestants have rejected oral tradition as equal with Scripture. Protestants seek to go back directly to a pure understanding of the Word of God despite their failure to do so most of the time. Yet here is a different formal principle in regard to origins. The method opened up catholic Christianity to corruption through a decadent Greek intelligence; the Third made heaven and earth dependent on assent to a creed rather than faith in Christ. The net effect of this is to provide a movement for the maintenance of the Catholic church. Distinguishing between origin and development, he makes the former the formulation of a proposition of faith in a logical manner and then enforced by the church. Development is its subsequent role in the church. In the Catholic church the Logos Greek Christology was originated at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century. His outline is like this:

1. The origin of dogma
2. The development of dogma in accordance with its original idea (the Oriental development from the Arian controversey to the debate on images)
3. The Western development of dogma under the influence of Augustine and the policy of the Roman popes
4. Three fold issue of dogma in:

    a) Churches of the Reformation

---

[1] Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1905), I, 1; See also Garvie, op. cit., p. 104.

b) Tridentine Catholicism

c) Criticism of the Enlightenment, especially Socinianism[1]

The history of dogma teaches four lessons, lessons which Rauschenbusch absorbed quite clearly:

> 1. The assertion of the Churches that the dogmas are exclusively the expostion of the Christian revelation alone because drawn by inference from the Holy Scriptures is not confirmed by historical research. On the contrary, this shows that dogmatic Christianity (the dogmas) in its conception and execution is a work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the gospel. The logical means, by which the attempt was made in ancient times to make the gospel intelligible and to confirm it, have been fused together with its contents.[2]
>
> 2. As the view of dogma as a pure representation of the gospel shows itself as an illusion, even so historical research disturbs also the other illusion of the Churches, that dogma has always been the same in them, therefore has only been unfolded, and that Christian theology has never had another task than to expound the always similar dogma, and to refute false doctrines coming in from without. It shows rather than theology has formed dogma, but that the Church was compelled always to conceal with a grudge the work of the theologians, and these were therewith put in a bad position.[3]
>
> 3. Although Dogmatic Christianity in the course of development never lost its original form and character as the work of the spirit of decadent antiquity on the soil of the gospel, yet it has experienced a deep-reaching transformation, first by Augustine and then by Luther.[4]
>
> 4. The history of dogma, while exhibiting the process of the origin and development of dogma, yields the most appropriate means to free the church from dogmatic Christianity, and to hasten the unceasing process of emancipation began with Augustine. But it also bears witness to the unity of the Christian faith in the course of history, in so far as it proves that certain fundamental ideas of the gospel have never been lost, and have bidden defiance to all its assaults.[5]

The foregoing materials suggest the method which Harnack, a Ritschlian historian, bequeathed to Rauschenbusch also a Ritschlian historian. Orthodoxy is attacked not because it has a given ingredient of Divine revelation as much as because it is culturally conditioned and yet will not admit its birth certificate . Its method of abstracting propositions from its mixed ancestry must be replaced by a contextualism which locates all the causal factors human and Divine, the latter pointing to a return to three positive truths to be mentioned in the next paragraph. In any case, a new theology is called for which returns not to Catholicism but what appears to be akind of mixture of the Jesus of the synoptic gospels plus certain motifs from the Enlightenment.

---

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-8; Garvie, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-107.

[2] Adolph Harnack, *op. cit.*, I, 11; Garvie, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 9; *ibid.*, p. 108.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 8; *ibid.*, p. 108.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 11; *ibid.*, p. 108.

If this is the kind of method bequeathed to Rauschenbusch he also found Harnack's positive theology attractive. As a matter of fact, the similarity is striking as we have found previously with other Ritschlians. For example, the basic emphasis of What is Christianity? is almost identical with Rauschenbusch's The Social Principles of Jesus, each book, incidentally, being the best seller of the respective writers. Both books were attempts to place in popular form the essential emphases of their more scholarly works. Harnack declares that "theologians of every country only half discharge their duties if they think it enough to treat the Gospel in the recondite language of learning and bury it in scholarly folios."[1]

What is Christianity? Or, what are the leading features of Jesus' message? The answer according to Harnack is as follows:

1. The Kingdom of God and its coming: The apocalyptic materials are the husks, the parables are the kernel of Jesus' Kingdom message. The Kingdom, in Harnack's reading of it, is "tamer" than that of Rauschenbusch but the definition is essentially on the same gradualistic ground. Unquestionably, though, it is a bit more internal and much less radically external than the Rochester interpretation.

2. God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul: It is the fatherly providence of God which is here affirmed. This is affirmed in a more pietistic sense since Harnack calls this the restful aspect of the message

---

[1] Adolph Harnack, What is Christianity? (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901), author's Preface to the English Edition.

of Jesus, disavowing a sense of tension and antithesis.

3. The higher righteousness and the commandment of love: Love and mercy are ends in themselves and are not secondary to worship. In all questions of morality Jesus goes to the root of the matter in the disposition and intention. Here is where "the higher righteousness" is understood as the reality in the depths of the human heart. Ritual and worship are not the answers, prudential morality is not the answer. The all important root and motive of ethics is one and one alone, namely, love. Religion is the soul of morality and morality the soul of religion. The definitive expression of Jesus' religion and ethics is the Sermon on the Mount.[1]

Now permit Rauschenbusch to answer this question: What are the leading features of Jesus message? The answer is, first, the Kingdom of God and its coming; second, the value of life where personality is sacred; third, the spiritual solidarity of all men, creating the sacredness of fellowship; fourth, love leads us to identify with the weak and to suffer for the Kingdom's sake when conflict arises.[2] This is similar to the basic affirmations of Harnack.

Harnack is thus the most quoted writer in Rauschenbusch's books. He is given lavish praise and real use in the Rauschenbusch system. Harnack bequeaths to Rauschenbusch his basic method in historical research. Harnack and Rauschenbusch reach strikingly similar conclusions. Rauschenbusch's more sectarian feeling for the analogous impact of democratic churches on a democratic culture is one crucial theme not found in Harnack. Harnack, above all, is a major influence in the liberalism of Rauschenbusch since he seemed to destroy all the classical theological formulations of Christianity as Hellenistic accretions. Harnack therefore must be considered as one of the major figures in the origins of Rauschenbusch's social ethics--particularly in a negative way by what he destroyed, namely, orthodox theology.

---

[1] Harnack, _ibid_., pp. 49-74.

[2] Rauschenbusch, _The Social Principles of Jesus_, _op. cit_.

2. Ernst Troeltsch

Rauschenbusch referred to Troeltsch's The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches as monumental and as the "first and chief attempt to apply the methods of the history of doctrine to the social via convictions and hopes of the churches."[1]

Despite the use of the words "monumental, first and chief" it is difficult to find any explicit references to Troeltsch in his writings other than this one lavish declaration. The present writer proposes the hypothesis that Troeltsch's great work arrived too late (1911 in German and 1931 in English) to be the kind of book available in the most formative and functional years of his development. On the other hand, his superlatives suggest that he recognized at once that the attempt to find the interaction of theology and ethics and sociology was precisely what he was seeking to accomplish. And, moreover, the typology of church-sect-mystic conveyed a great deal of what he was trying to say but without such a sharp and compact typological formulation.

Troeltsch as the historian who saw the primary role of the sects in creating the modern world and Troeltsch the theologian are not always brought together. Massive learning within such a suggestive typology might not ever raise the question of his theological and philosophical presuppositions. Actually Troeltsch and Harnack are the last two great liberals of German theology and historiography. Barth studied under Harnack and rejected him.

H. Richard Niebuhr considers Troeltsch the "leading theologian of the religio-historical school and a chief representative of non-skeptical relativism in philosophy of history."[2] H. R. Mackintosh views Troeltsch as reacting against Ritschl despite his neo-Kantian background. He objected to Ritschl's neglect of apologetic questions arising out of Natural Science, his emphasis upon a final revelation mediated through history, and his tendency to ignore the new facts brought to light by the scientific History of Religions.[1]

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 28.

[2] H. R. Niebuhr, "Ernst Troeltsch," ed. V. Ferm, An Encyclopedia of Religion (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945), p. 96.

It seems very doubtful if Rauschenbusch was prepared to follow Troeltsch into even a non-skeptical relativism since Rauschenbusch always had an unadulterated Jesus whom one could reach after stripping off Hellenized theology, and rejecting the theology of money and the theology of despotism. On the other hand, Troeltsch's systematic study of ethics weighted toward the left-wing was a great confirmation of Rauschenbusch's lifetime attempt to see the context for ethical and theological struggles. Actually, Rauschenbusch's real inner drive was more in the direction of what Troeltsch did in the Social Teaching than what Harnack aimed for in The History of Dogma. A theology of institutions and their development was to receive great help from Troeltsch the historian.

With the major influence on origins from Harnack and perhaps the minor impact from Troeltsch, it is important to see what a dynamically liberating force church history proved to be in the ministry of Walter Rauschenbusch.

In his essay, "The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology" he notes that "history is a renovating and reformatory influence in theology."[2] He declares that "theology dislikes to discover that some golden candlestick which it has long lighted in honor of the Lord is only plated and the brass is wearing through."[3] He urges the reader to follow Carlyle's wise exhortation: "When you find a lie, kill it tenderly as though you loved it."[4]

---

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), pp. 193-194.

[2] Walter Rauschenbusch, American Journal of Theology, XI, 54.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., p. 63.

"Historical study," Rauschenbusch observed, "is a truly catholic influence. It shows that every religious body has much to blush for in its own history and much to admire in others. Each church is but a partial reflection of the truth. But the church of Jesus Christ in its totality has sublime authority."[1]

Thus Rauschenbusch saw history as a basic part of his equipment in the development of a liberal social message in the church. History is needed to renovate, reform, recover the Truth and to make Christians humble concerning their theological and ethical errors.

From the left-wing of the Reformation Rauschenbusch received a radical sense of historical periodization and the use of the principle of analogy between church patterns and cultural patterns.

From the Enlightenment historians he received an attack on merely verbal orthodoxy plus a concept of the cultural conditioning of theology--what Shailer Mathews characterized as transcendentalized politics and what Rauschenbusch would have viewed as transcendentalized economics.

The present writer can think of no more fitting quotation to close this study of history than the following remark of Roger Lincoln Shinn in his Christianity and the Problem of History:

> There is little excuse for our generation, though it may have learned some things that the Social Gospel did not know, to sneer or condescend to Rauschenbusch. His purposes were so unquestionably generous and his enthusiasm so genuine that we would be foolish and ungrateful to forget his message. But since we have experienced a fury and intensity of history which he did not expect, and have found a persistent and demonic power in evil which he barely guessed at, we can recover powerful aspects of the Christian tradition which he ignored.[2]

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Value and the Use of History," Colgate-Rochester Scrapbook, III (May, 1914).

[2] Roger Lincoln Shinn, Christianity and the Problem of History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 125. See also the critique of Rauschenbusch as church historian by George Hunston Williams in his chapter on church history in Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century, ed. Arnold S. Nash (New York: The Macmillant Co., 1951).

Part Two: The Liberal Socio-Economic Thinkers

A. Major Influences

This is the second section of this chapter. The chronological point for it, roughly speaking, is the New York pastorate. Naturally, socio-economic thinkers will make major contributions to the development of the ethics of Rauschenbusch. The theologians, Biblical scholars and historians prepared the way. The climax came from men laboring more directly in the area of ethics.

With regard to the proof of origins, the impact of Henry George on Rauschenbusch is relatively clear. The testimony of Rauschenbusch is decisive as to a solid, major influence early in his awakening. The fact that Henry George was a successful writer as well as effective politician makes the impact doubly effective in Rauschenbusch's crucial early days in the Hell's Kitchen pastorate and in his liberal awakening. Just as no theologians can equal the impact of Ritschl on Rauschenbusch's origins so it is that no socio-economic thinker can equal the role of Henry George. Yet other liberal thinkers in the socio-economic realm made their contribution, however minor.

1. Henry George

> I owe my own first awakening to the world of social problems to the agitation of Henry George in 1886 and wish here to record my lifelong debt to this single-minded apostle of a great truth.[1]

No testimony on origins could be clearer than this.

The immediate impact of Henry George was to stimulate Rauschenbusch literarily. In 1887 he wrote a paper on the ideas of Henry George, inserting on the margin of the manuscript: "My first paper on the social question."[2] Even more striking is the fact that he committed to memory whole chapters of Henry

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 394.

[2] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 80; this manuscript was loaned to the present writer by D. R. Sharpe.

George's writings, "so that much of his writings are tinged with George's ideals and philosophy."[1]

Rauschenbusch insisted that Henry George was more than a tax reformer. He preferred to view George as the prophet of a new social order. The most recent book on Henry George (1955) refers correctly to the "Triple Legacy of Georgism": the fiscal reform Georgism of the single tax; the political Georgism which entered into many varities of reform activity; the moral and intellectual Georgism which reconstructed religion, philosophy and ethics.[2] Walter Rauschenbusch was influenced by all three of these legacies. He utilized the single tax insight and supplemented it with socialism; he entered into George's mayoralty campaign in New York in 1886; he partook of the radical reconstruction of religion in Henry George, a pious refugee from the Episcopalian church.

Daniel Bell views George as "paramount in the authentic tradition of the great agrarian reformers of the United States."[3] George R. Geiger considers George in the great liberal tradition of America.[4]

It is in the sense that George is a part of the great liberal tradition that we should see his work. In an address to the Baptist Congress in Toronto, 1889, Rauschenbusch makes this point regarding George as economist:

> He is often called a socialist, but it is incorrect to call him so; he is not a socialist, but the strongest advocate of laissez-faire in the highest sense of the term. Therefore, he insists that artificial monopolies, such as the tariff should be swept away, and that freedom should be given to the natural forces of society, and that natural monopolies should

---

[1] Ibid., p. 426.

[2] Charles Albro Barker, Henry George (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 621.

[3] Daniel Bell, Socialism and American Life, eds., Donald Drew Egbert and Stow Persons (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), I, 241.

[4] George R. Geiger, The Philosophy of Henry George (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933), p. 384.

be owned and managed by the community to which they naturally belong.[1] This, quite obviously, is a consistent expression of the older liberalism seeking just by a natural harmony of forces, now blocked by artificial monopolies. From George Rauschenbusch accepted the principle that artificial monopolies must go; from the socialists he accepted the principle that socializing the means of production is a necessary monopoly.[2]

Consider, now, a more systematic presentation of Henry George's convictions as they influenced Walter Rauschenbusch:

1. The rational religion of the Enlightenment

Henry George was raised in a pious low-church Episcopalian home of Philadelphia where the King James Bible, the Book of Common Prayer and regular church going were basic disciplines. A large family suffering with straightened circumstances in an era of depression, the Georges were seriously committed to the church. Yet, Henry George was never confirmed at the Philadelphia church. Apparently, orthodoxy never became vital to him. Yet, he was always religious in piety and spirit.

Although he quit school at fourteen, George partook of the rich Franklinian legacy of adult education in Philadelphia and became a well read individual possessed with a brilliant English style in writing.

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "Natural and Artificial Monopolies," Rauschenbusch Source-book With Commentary, ed., C. H. Moehlman, p. 36.

[2] Ibid., p. 37. Daniel Bell's essay in the Princeton symposium Socialism and American Life quotes a letter by Karl Marx concerning Henry George. Among other remarks are these: "Theoretically the man (George) is utterly backward! He understands nothing about the nature of surplus value. (His) idea originally belonged to the bourgeois economists; it was put forth by the earliest radical followers of Ricardo, soon after his death. . . This cloven hoof (at the same time ass's hoof) is also unmistakably revealed in the declamations of Henry George. . . On the other hand George's book, like the sensation it has made with you, is significant because it is a first, if unsuccessful attempt at emancipation from the orthodox political economy." Letter of Marx to Sorge, June 30, 1881. Quoted, Socialism and American Life, p. 240.

Philosophically, he spent much time refuting Herbert Spencer and was devoted to Schopenhauer concept of the will. He ends Progress and Poverty with a quote from Plutarch which is purely Platonic. He was also influenced by Thomas Spence (Rights of Man), Ogilvie, Filangieri, Paine, Jefferson, Spinoza and Locke.

The profound religious problem which led to the reconstruction of his religious outlook was: Given a benevolent Creator active in human affairs, how can we account for the presence of want, suffering and starvation?[1] Stated in economic terms it was this: How can we account for poverty in the midst of plenty?

Geiger believes that George's concept of God "was entirely divorced from Christian revelation and Scripture, and was disclosed to man only by the light of reason."[2] According to his survey, George had a compound of three basic convictions all familiar to the Enlightenment:

1. Natural law
2. Natural rights
3. Deism

In terms of the Mead-Nichols typology George would be a Christian Deist, standing to the right of the anti-Christian Deists, and to the left of the rational super-naturalists. Thus he writes of his effort to purge Christianity of alien elements yet retaining some faith in the essence of the faith:

> Though Christianity became distorted and alloyed in percolating through a rotting civilization; though pagan gods were taken into her pantheon, and pagan forms into her ritual, and pagan ideas into her creed; yet her essential idea of equality was never wholly destroyed.[3]

---

[1] Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 36. See Dombrowski's chapter "Henry George: a Prophet of Social Justice."

[2] Geiger, op. cit., p. 375.

[3] Henry George, Progress and Poverty (New York: Random House, n. d.), p. 523.

While clinging to the belief that Christianity, almost in spite of itself, has always retained some of its simple moralistic essence, George is characteristically anti-institutional Christianity:

> This is a most Christian city. There are churches and churches. All sorts of churches, where are preached all sorts of religions, save that which once in Galilee taught the arrant socialistic doctrine that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God; all save that which once in Jerusalem drove the money-changers from the temple.[1]

Thus, many basic themes of Enlightenment religion are here in the outlook of one who reacted against Episcopal piety. But it is not an irreverent Voltaire or a profane Mencken taunting the believers with a sharp rapier. It is a prophet recalling people to the grand simplicities of the faith structured in an elaborate social ethic.

It is characteristic of Rauschenbusch that no one ever spoke to his condition who did not retain a reverent religious spirit along with an prophetic, anti-orthodox outlook.

2. The Kingdom of God motif

Henry George was something of a lay preacher. In a sermon in Glasgow in 1889 he revealed the role of the Kingdom in his thinking. He believed:

> . . .that a very kingdom of God might be brought on this earth if men would but seek to do justice--if men would but acknowledge the essential principle of Christianity, that of doing to others as we would others do to us, and recognizing that we are all here equally the children of one Father, equally entitled to live our lives and develop our faculties, and to apply our labor to the raw material he has provided.[2]

In this same passage Henry George insists that early Christianity did not pray for the Kingdom in heaven but one on earth. He insists that the persecution of Christians was not due to religious reasons but because it was a great movement for social reform, preaching the Gospel of Justice.

Here, then, is a view of the Kingdom defined in terms of reform and social justice with the theological presupposition of the Golden Rule interpreted as equality.

---

[1] Geiger, op. cit., quotes George, p. 339. [2] Ibid., p. 340.

3. Optimistic-utopian view of history

Coupled with his view of the Kingdom is the picture of what life will be like *if* we embrace Liberty and Justice:

> With want destroyed; with greed changed to noble passions; with the fraternity that is born of equality taking the place of the jealousy and fear that now array men against each other; with mental power loosed by conditions that give to the humblest comfort and leisure; and who shall measure the heights to which our civilization may soar? Words fail the thought! It is the Golden Age of which poets have sung and high-raised seers have told in metaphor! It is the glorious vision which has always haunted man with gleams of fitful splendor. It is what he saw whose eyes at Patmos were closed in a trance. It is the culmination of Christianity--the City of God on earth with its walls of jasper and its gates of pearl! It is the reign of the Prince of Peace.[1]

This is an eloquent picture of the perfect society, a great social hope which moved untold thousands to feverish activity because deliverance was a real historical possiblity. Admittedly, Rauschenbusch was less utopian than this but it was more a matter of degree.

4. Fellowship and Solidarity as key social realities

The basic law of social progress is the phenomenon of association, gregariousness with ever-increasing kinds of communalism. As cooperation increases less time is put on sheer maintenance and more is available for real progress.

Yet there is internal resistance to man's innate communalistic cooperation. This counter-force is *inequality*, not a product of biology, but the creature of civilization itself. Specialized social growth tends to create inequality but it need not do so. Hence, with this integration comes unequal distribution of wealth and power. Now one side expends all its mental powers in maintaining existence based on a crude inequality. The other side, keeps up inequality because it brings luxury, ostentation and warfare.

---

[1] George, *op. cit.*, p. 552.

What is the key which will permit true association to be recovered? Association through equality is the law of progress. The key to associational equality is land value. Because this is true rent becomes cosmically significant. It is the tangible manifestation of the intangible power of association, it is the concrete material measure of the subtle and imponderable elements of gregariousness. Rent is the exchange rate for man's development.[1]

It is one more vigorous attempt to show the fundamental corporateness of mankind. Obviously the economic factor plus the concept of equality are the keys rather than a solidaristic view which partook more of Matthew 25.

5. The economic interpretation of ethics

Geiger is right when he observed that George made economics a branch of ethics. This emphasis was destined to enter the deepest consciousness of the social gospel and maintain itself until Reinhold Niebuhr and his followers made politics a branch of ethics.

The union of economics and ethics was due to union of psychology with the social sciences whereby human nature is seen as a social variable, subject to the direction and conditioning of external forces; he based politics upon economics; he interpreted the rise and fall of civilizations in relation to the economic process; he insisted on the attachment of religious significance to the land and the process of rental on the land; he pointed to the evil of poverty as the by-product of inequality; he had a searching judgment on avarice and materialism; he maintained a sense of shame for wasted and frustrated mental energy because of debilitating poverty and inequality. Henry George fixed indelibly the mighty role of the economic factor in the human struggle for the good life. Nothing was more characteristic of Rauschenbusch himself.

---

[1] George, ibid., pp. 505, 511, 515, 165-172, 328-330.

6. A specific solution for the social problem

Henry George left a legacy of specifics rather than glittering generalities. Given certain religious presuppositions, given a view of history, given a concept of association as the basic fact of human life, then what is the inference for institutions in society?

In Progress and Poverty his specific proposal is contained in this paragraph:

> I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land. The first would be unjust; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call their land. Let them continue to call it their land. Let them buy and sell, and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell, if we take the kernel. It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent.[1]

A specific solution was proposed dealing with a deep problem of human life--the use of the land. It challenged classical economics. It lead to an astounding circulation of two-million for Progress and Poverty in fifteen languages. It lead to many municipal reform movements. Its moral presuppositions stirred Tolstoy in far away Russia. Above all the vibrant personality back of these ideas campaigning for mayor of New York awakened a pietistic Baptist parson to seek a richer more profound social ethic. Twenty-seven years later Rauschenbusch's first major book was published. In it he wrote: "The brilliant books of Henry George, 'Progress and Poverty' and 'Social Problems' are still worth reading. In his main contentions he has never been answered."[2]

George's concept of natural law and natural rights was never fully utilized by Rauschenbusch since he utilized love more than law. George's philosophical context was bound to introduce illusions into his thinking. Rauschenbusch himself indicated that socialism seemed a fuller doctrine for his social ethic than Georgism alone. Nevertheless, Henry George was typical of many who nurtured the Rochester social prophet: emancipated Christians of the Enlightenment seeking a radical reorganization of society.

---

[1] George, ibid., p. 405.

[2] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 229.

2. Edward Bellamy

Rauschenbusch's biographers agree that he was also influenced by Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward (Boston, 1888),[1] a book which W. D. P. Bliss called "one of the ablest socialist utopians ever written."[2] A book which likely belongs with Uncle Tom's Cabin in influence and which is a close second to Stowe's novel in sales, hence, an all-time best seller.

The relation of Rauschenbusch to Bellamy is not as close as to Henry George yet it is still very real. The difference likely was due to the fact that Henry George reached Rauschenbusch in his political campaign during those highly impressionable days in the New York pastorate. And the further belief of Rauschenbusch that any Utopia cannot equal the richness of de facto living.[3]

Yet it is equally clear that Rauschenbusch knew the Bellamy book and was eager to defend it against severe critics as, for example, the editor of The Inquirer who attacked it in 1889. In his reply the Rochester historian declared that socialism is worthy of attention, arguing that it was no longer mere theory but the actual guide for legislation in various countries of the world, especially England and Germany. England was mainly municipal and Germany more national. As for Bellamy's vision itself, he insisted that this was not a bizarre creation of the author but the glorious dream of a whole generation of earnest seekers. Moreover, the principles of Bellamy's thoughts give us hope, and "to some of us who live among the people, life would scarcely be tolerable if we had no hope to buoy us up and give us patience in waiting for better days."[1]

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 197, 426; Bodein, op. cit., p. 5; Harry Ward, Dictionary of America Biography (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1935), XV, 392.

[2] W. D. P. Bliss, Encylopedia of Social Reform (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1908), p. 107. Speaking of Bellamy's novels as a whole, Bliss says: "They are dreamy, fantastic novels but with such power that Mr. Howells declared that 'the mantle of Hawthorne has fallen upon Mr. Bellamy.' "

[3] Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 329.

Before proceeding to show some of the influences on Rauschenbusch in Bellamy, it is necessary to point out the clash between Henry George and Edward Bellamy. Henry George originated in the long current of radicalism which has flowed from the Anglican stream; Edward Bellamy originated in the free church background of the Baptists. Yet in a sense, the ethical roles are reversed with Anglican decentralization and Baptist socialism instead of the expected Anglican feeling for government control and the Baptist stress on decentralization and liberty. Henry George represented an agrarian type of radicalism with a suspicion of too much state power. In 1889 Henry George reviewed Looking Backward in his weekly paper, The Standard charging that socialism promoted state power to an excessive level. George wanted a revolution in property rights through the nationalization of land but not the state management of land.[2] Bellamy, on the other hand, represents the more urban-industrial kind of socialism which had two keys: equality of income and nationalized production of all economic goods and services with the organizing principle of an Industrial Army, explicitly patterned after military organization, a lifelong fascination of Bellamy with military matters. In the face of this criticism by George, it would be accurate to say that George is a liberal and Bellamy a real socialist radical. Indeed, the view of Nationalists (as Bellamy's party was known) was that George alerted the country to the need for the socialization which Bellamy took to its logical conclusion. George would make rent from the land a public trust, Bellamy would make interest on capital plus rent on the land public trusts. George would retain private management. Bellamy would have an Industrial Army.

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, "That Boston Fad," Christian Inquirer, August, 1889, quoted in Bodein, op. cit., p. 5.

[2] The clash between George and Bellamy is splendidly documented in Barker's Henry George, op. cit., pp. 307, 311, 507, 541, 561.

Henry George clashed with Thomas Huxley on the right, fighting what Barker calls an evolutionary-minded elitism and conservatism in the name of a natural rights philosophy in the Jeffersonian tradition. On the left he criticized the Bellamy socialism in terms of these same presuppositions. Yet Bellamy's socialism was far removed from the Marxian variety since there is no suggestion of class war. The capitalistic trusts are to be replaced by the logical perhaps inevitable next step--the Great Trust of the United States Government--why not?[1]

Yet when the smoke cleared it was obvious that Bellamy's socialism was, as Barker put it, growing at the expense of Henry George "because it recognized that other values than land gained unearned increments."[2] Professor Edwin Seligman of Columbia attacked George's plan as being too singular and resting too much on a natural law foundation.[3]

It was significant, however, that Rauschenbusch's social concern grew up under the impact of two of the most effective mass propagandists in American social history--Henry George, 1839-1897 and Edward Bellamy, 1850-1898. Rauschenbusch appears to have forever kept George in his affections and his social outlook, heaping upon him the highest praise. Yet, he also appears to have gone along with the more comprehensive and less singular socialist doctrine of Bellamy.

One wonders if this clash between Henry George and Edward Bellamy does not represent a kind of permanent dilemma in Rauschenbusch and, for that matter, much of the social gospel movement, if not American democracy as a whole. It is the struggle between a liberalism which wants far reaching social changes without a thoroughgoing use of the State because of its fear of excessive power, and a socialism which wants to utterly destroy competition with State power and then constructively organized a socialist society with this same power. The symbol of Rauschenbusch's dilemma may well have been his refusal to join any available socialist party despite his synthesis of George and Bellamy.[1]

---

[1] Robert L. Shurter's introduction to the Modern Library edition of Looking Backward, 1951, p. ix. This book also contains the best bibliography available on Bellamy, pp. xxii-xxiii apart from the definitive work, Arthur E. Morgan, Edward Bellamy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944).

[2] Barker, op. cit., p. 566. [3] Ibid., p. 567.

With this background we move to specific characteristics in Bellamy's thought which are reflected in Rauschenbusch's outlook.

1. The rational religion of the Enlightenment expressed in the key concept of Solidarity

According to H. Richard Niebuhr Bellamy's religion represents both the affinity and the conflict between Romantic liberalism and Evangelicalism. The dream of progress is rooted in Christian faith yet clothed in Romantic ideas in large clusters.[2]

Precisely this appears to be the case with Bellamy. His pious upbringing in the Baptist church persists in terms of a deeply religious sensitivity yet the content of his religion is from the Enlightenment. He never ceased reading the Bible and also never ceased reconstructing his orthodox background.

Walter A. Smith's Master's thesis at Columbia on The Religion of Edward Bellamy says that the following quotation from Equality represents the very core of his religion:

For universal love is at once the seed and fruit, cause and effect of

---

[1] See Rauschenbusch's criticism of socialism in A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, ed. Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), pp. 90-91.

[2] H. R. Niebuhr, op. cit., pp. 190-191.

> the highest completest knowledge. Through boundless love man becomes a god, for thereby he is made conscious of his oneness with God, and all things are put under his feet. It has been only since the Great Revolution brought in the era of human brotherhood that mankind has been able to eat abundantly of the fruit of the tree of knowledge and thereby grow more and more into the consciousness of the divine soul as the essential self and the true holding of our lives.[1]

Here was a doctrine based on the loving self-realization of the person in the Universal consciousness of the Divine. It is essentially pantheistic in its doctrine of God, Tolstoyan in its ethics, socialist in its economics and politics, optimistic in its view of man.

When Dr. Barton gave his long sermon in Looking Backward, he had a comment to make about the nature of man:

> Soon was fully revealed, what the divines and philosophers of the old world never would have believed, that human nature in its essential qualities is good, not bad, that men by their natural intention and structure are generous, not selfish, pitiful, not cruel, sympathetic, not arrogant, godlike in aspirations, instinct with divest impulses of tenderness and self-sacrifice, images of God indeed, not the travesties upon Him they had seemed. The constant pressure, through numberless generations, of conditions of life which might have perverted angels, had not been able to essentially alter the natural nobility of the stock, and these conditions once removed, like a bent tree, it had sprung back to its normal uprightness.[2]

Thus Bellamy has a doctrine of original nobility obscured by the temporary conditioning of evil social institutions. Delivered from these evil institutions, particularly economic, the original nobility would be restored.

Bellamy's major statement on theological matters was his essay, "The Religion of Solidarity," written when he was twenty-three. He believed that in the religion of solidarity is found the only rational philosophy of moral instincts. One has almost a Whiteheadian sense of the oneness of process of which the individual is a part. He declares:

> It is the instinct of solidarity, however construed or unconfessed,

---

[1] Walter A. Smith, The Religion of Edward Bellamy (unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1937), pp. 90-91.

[2] Edward Bellamy, Looking Backward, op. cit., pp. 234-235.

> which lends man a consciousness of greatness otherwise unaccountable, a sense of majesty, utterly, nay, ludicrously beyond that which is warranted by the proportion of his personality to the sum of personalities. It is this which makes a man, however good his will, quite unable to isolate himself in idea from the general frame of things, and conceive of the universe going on without him. The universe never did and never will go on without him. It is this which renders it all essential for his comfort to feel that he is acting as a part of some universal plan or frame of things, thus making some sort of religion or philosophy indispensable to him, and rendering the notion of unconnected, isolated action abhorrent to his soul.[1]
>
> What an apotheosis of humanity will it be when men so realize the relation of their transitory lives as persons and as individuals to their eternal and unbroken life of solidarity as to count death but an incident of life, and no longer the dreary abyss of existence.[2]
>
> Time is not a vestibule of eternity but a part of it. We are now living our immortal lives. This present life is its own perfect consummation, its own reason and excuse. The life of infinite range that our intuitions promise us lies even now open round about us. The avenues leading to it, the vistas opening upon it are those universal instincts that continually stir us and which followed out would lead us thither.[3]

Thus, Edward Bellamy spelled out the religious and philosophical foundations of the liberal Religion of Solidarity. It is a religion which is pantheistic. It is a rational approach which Arthur E. Morgan interprets as similar to the religions of the East. Morgan has no explanation for the origin of this emphasis but is quite sure that there runs through Bellamy's writing a strain which represents the thinking of India.[4]

Apart from the Bible, Bellamy was influenced, according to Morgan, by Plutarch's Life of Lycurgus where a semi-military organization of the State sounds like his Industrial Army. Other lesser influences were Joseph Bellamy (his grandfather), Robert Owen, John Stuart Mill, Fourier and Fenelon.

2. The Kingdom of God motif

One of his favorite terms was the Great Revolution. Another was the Great Revival. These terms suggested the Kingdom of God on earth which he believed Christ bade men to hope and work for. His anti-ecclesiastical outlook is seen when he points out:

---

[1] Walter Smith, op. cit., p. 106. [2] Ibid., p. 107.

[3] Ibid. Bellamy's philosophical writings have been published separately by Arthur E. Morgan in The Philosophy of Edward Bellamy (New York: King's Crown Press, 1944).

[4] Morgan, op. cit., p. 203.

> For many ages—almost, indeed, from the beginning of the Christian era—the churches had turned their backs on Christ's ideal of a Kingdom of God to be realized on earth by the adoption of the law of mutual helpfulness and fraternal love . . . The clergy in the name of the author of the Lord's prayer had taught the people not to expect God's will to be done on earth . . . They had made themselves the bulwarks and defense of existing social and political institutions.
>
> When the people came to recognize that the ideal of a world of equal welfare, which had been represented to them by the clergy as a dangerous delusion, was no other than the very dream of Christ . . . it is not to be wondered at that the impulse which the revolutionary movement received should have been overwhelming.[1]

Thus the Kingdom of God is the Great Revolution now breaking forth against money power. This is not far from Rauschenbusch's view although Rauschenbusch had more religious depth.

3. Optimistic-utopian view of history

Already we have dealt with Bellamy's doctrine of original nobility temporarily perverted but which will snap back—and fairly easily—once the fully socialist society is set up. At the end of Chapter Twenty-Six in Looking Backward Bellamy rapturously sings forth: "With a tear for the dark past, turn we then to the dazzling future, and, veiling our eyes, press forward. The long and weary winter of the race is ended. Its summer has begun. Humanity has burst the chrysalis. The heavens are before it."[2] This is typical of many passages in his writings which suggest the immanent, concrete possibility of a radical thrust ever upward since we have located the nub of the problem, namely, ruthless competition in an evil socio-economic order.

4. The economic interpretation of ethics

Most of the influences pouring into the earliest social gospel thinkers emphasized the economic forces as the crucial element in ethics. This was behind, beneath, before all the facades and ideological trimmings of human life. Deal with this and you deal with the real issue. Our introductory section made this clear. In Equality he declared: "Nothing can be in the long run or on a large scale sound economics which is not sound ethics."[1]

---

[1] Edward Bellamy, Equality, quoted in Morgan, op. cit., pp. 303-304.

[2] Bellamy, Looking Backward, op. cit., pp. 238-239.

5. Socialism as the specific solution

In the opening section we dealt with the clash between George and Bellamy, a clash between a liberal and a radical use of socialization. The point here is that Bellamy conveyed the idea ot men like Rauschenbusch and the social gospel group that a religious solution must be comprehensive with analyses of many things from time and eternity to a specific economic program. His utopian socialism was that specific program. This basically was the master answer which captured the social movement in the churches in one form or another.

Bellamy's Christian impulse to better the social order was clothed in the garments of the Enlightenment. His view of God, man, church, sin, and history was Romantically liberal. This was yoked to one of the most effective writers in American history; a writer with a huge audience leading to political organization. Rauschenbusch unquestionably lived in a kind of pleroma of social concern.

3. John Ruskin, 1819-1900

Sharpe notes that "Ruskin was constantly read not only for his superb literary style and his high descriptions but also for the social message of this revolutionary spirit--for this cultured, artistic, literary stylist could not only write about cathedrals and paintings, he was the prophet for a new social era."[2] It is clear that Rauschenbusch read and enthusiastically quoted

---

[1] Quoted in Morgan, op. cit., p. 304.

[2] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 426.

Ruskin's Unto This Last.

John Ruskin was a Romantic anti-industrialist who, according to Troeltsch, represents the end of Puritanism and the entrance of a spiritual esthetic temper into English life.[1] It is the English counter-part of German romanticism, estheticism and immanentistic mysticism. Ruskin stood for an emphasis upon craftsmanship and the arts as an entrance into the good society, a mood reflected in the U. S. A. more recently by Lewis Mumford, Van Wyck Brooks, and Waldo Frank. Ruskin's criticism is rooted in the arts and crafts of the middle ages and is aimed at a cold, crass, banal, dull, stultifying industrialism.

Ruskin changed the focus from specific issues like wages, hours, monopolies, corporations, single tax, socialization to the over-all impact of capitalism and industrialism with the impact along the following lines, all explicit in Christianizing the Social Order:

1. Capitalistic-industrialism is an ugly, anti-human system which demands the systematic disobedience to the first principles of Christianity.[2] It is inherently in conflict with everything Christian.

2. Wealth is not necessarily a sign of virtue, nor poverty a sign of vice. The only wealth is life; all else is not wealth but "ill-th."[3]

3. Art has its roots in the moral life. Permanent ugliness is a product of sin and a producer of brutality. It is significant that this Ruskinian epigram adorns the opening paragraph of Rauschenbusch's altogether remarkable chapter on "Commercialism and Beauty" in Christianitizing the Social Order.

---

[1] Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1949), p. 795.

[2] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 322. [3] Ibid., p. 294.

[4] Ibid., p. 252. These three citations all include a direct quotation of Ruskin for the support of the above points.

He felt very strongly that capitalistic industry and commerce were pathological in relation to beauty. Every word in this unique chapter (how many social reformers have a feeling for the esthetic?) breathes the spirit and influence of Ruskin.

4. Therefore, an economic system must be judged by what it does to human values as a whole rather than strictly economic issues in the arena of the market.

Francis Greenwood Peabody was right when he noted that Ruskin will be remembered for his invectives against the world as it was more than for his blueprint of what it ought to be.

It is doubtful if Ruskin's constructive position influenced Rauschenbusch a great deal. For example, the principle of exchange which abolishes all distinctions of ability and fidelity. Or, the tendency to oppose social movements which were not fighting industrialism as much as unjust capitalism. Or, Ruskin's hostility to America with its excessive trust in liberty and equality, what Carlyle called "our clutterbuck Republic."

Yet, this critique of the Romantic craftsman with an eye on the virtues of the middle ages against industrialism surely came through in Rauschenbusch but in a different context than Ruskin. Rauschenbusch, like Ruskin and Borsodi,[1] thought of the culture as "this ugly civilization." Henry George, Edward Bellamy and Ruskin--a prophetic trio with different constructive positions, yet all sturdily anti-capitalist.

4. Leo Tolstoy

Liberal influences in the economic thinking of Rauschenbusch are rounded out by the famous Russian anarchist, Leo Tolstoy. Sharpe's biography has seven references to the influence of this amazing Russian. The present writer is not aware of a single important book of Rauschenbusch without a laudatory quotation from Tolstoy. The book especially singled out is My Religion. There is a long quote from this book in The Social Principles of Jesus, showing how Tolstoy's life was changed when he perceived Jesus taught a way of life rather than the doctrinal vagaries of othodoxy. This book spells out his unitarian, moralistic, pacifist, prophetic, agrarian, anti-ecclesiastical view of Jesus and the problem of ethics. Troeltsch sees in Tolstoy a revival of the old radical sect idea, shorn of the Apocalyptic element, informed by Western pantheism and in utter conflict with whole Western technical-state tradition. He boldly proclaims the realization of the Sermon on the Mount.[1]

---

[1] Ralph Borsodi, This Ugly Civilization (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929).

Rauschenbusch explicitly draws the following points from Tolstoy:

1. Tolstoy's life was radically changed when he found the simple teachings of Jesus.[2]

2. Tolstoy was changed by his literal acceptance of the Sermon on the Mount and he shocked Christendom by insisting that the Sermon on the Mount was not millennial, other-worldly or futuristic but rather for the here and now.[3]

3. Tolstoy belongs in the prophetic "Jesus-strain" of those who announce God's will even when it impinges on commerce.[4]

4. Tolstoy taught voluntary poverty as the heroic corollary of the moral condemnation of unearned riches.[5]

The emphasis on the Sermon on the Mount is very clear in Rauschenbusch as, for example, the most widely read of his books, The Social Principles of Jesus. But the place where Tolstoy shines through the clearest is in Rauschenbusch's radical attack on unearned wealth and the foolish accumulation of money. Along with his large-scale interest in social institutions he focused on the personal equation in regard to riches. Chapter VI, "The Tragedy of Dives," in Christianizing the Social Order is the sort of critique which has tended to drop out of current social criticism. He shows that rich people (he calls them "my rich brothers") are in a tragic position struggling with superior forces which drag them down. It is a kind of predestined struggle with the guilty, strong rich man waging a losing battle with the moral powers of the universe closing in for retribution. There is a blind and hostile fate awaiting those in this struggle since they must obey two incompatible duties. In all soberness, Rauschenbusch noted that "every rich man is the sad hero of a tragedy, and the more noble and wise and righteous he is by nature, the more tragic his fate."[1]

---

[1] Troeltsch, op. cit., II, 728-29.

[2] Social Principles of Jesus, p. 88.

[3] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 314.

[4] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 164.

[5] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 292-293.

In Tolstoy and Rauschenbusch one will find some of the most devastating social criticism of riches ever penned. Here is Rauschenbusch spelling out the terrible dilemma of the Rich Man, a passage difficult to equal in Christian social concern without going back to St. Jerome:[2]

> The social order as it now is places its beneficiaries in a position where they cannot escape wrong and unhappiness. If they obey its laws, they enrich their own life, but at the expense of others, and in the end their apparent advantage turns out to be their own curse. They escape from the necessity of work, but in time idleness undoes either them or their descendents. Their wealth seems to promise large means of doing good, but they find their philanthropy a heavy burden on themselves and a questionable blessing for others. Their money gives them power, but that power is an intoxicant that undermines their sense of human values. It piles up their pleasures, but the more they surfeit, the less pleasure do they feel. It offers them free scope for their intellectual life, but it rusts the mainspring of their intellect. It holds out happiness for their families, and does its best to ruin them. It assures them of security and makes them camp among enemies. It increases their sense of strength by surrounding them with inferiors, and thereby relaxes their virility. It forces leadership on them, and yet chills the love of people which is the condition of leadership. It seems to win all the

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 309.

[2] Jerome's famous text: "All property is theft."

> powers of this world to their side, but it puts them on the wrong side in the final verdict of God, of humanity and of their own souls. This is the tragedy of Dives.[1]

George, Bellamy, Ruskin and Tolstoy are alike as children of the Enlightenment and anti-orthodox in their theological and philosophical presuppositions. Each, however, contributed a different aspect to Rauschenbusch's socio-economic thinking:

1. George: initial awakening to the need of economic change and political action with focus on the land problem through a more liberal limitation on the use of state action
2. Bellamy: a thoroughgoing socialist solution
3. Ruskin: an emphasis on the total impact of capitalism and industrialism on human personality with a quest for what Veglen called the instincts of craftsmanship
4. Tolstoy: voluntary poverty as an inference of the Sermon on the Mount coupled with great prophetic warnings on the ill effect of riches[2]

Only until we analyze the Christian socialists in the chapter on transformationism do we add to this economic spectrum.

5. Giuseppe Mazzini, 1805-1872

Rauschenbusch's relation to Mazzini concerns the meaning of nationality more than economics. He calls Mazzini a prophet, "to whom God has given an eye for the lessons of the past and an ear which he has laid on the beating heart of his own generation, and who, there is able to tell what shall be."[3] Rauschenbusch regarded Mazzini's *Essays* as a book of religion and to some "a book of devotion."[4] Sharpe has five references to Mazzini as among those who influenced Rauschenbusch. Apparently, Mazzini reached the heart of a number of American liberals since Jane Addams recalls her father's great sadness in

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, *ibid*., pp. 309-310.

[2] See also Rauschenbusch's address on "The Church and Wealth," given to the Baptist Congress in Augusta, Georgia, in 1893; Moehlman, *op. cit*., pp. 47-55.

[3] Sharpe, *op. cit*., p. 84.

[4] Sharpe, *op. cit*. p. 84.

1872 when word came that Mazzini had died. Rauschenbusch quotes Mazzini with approval as saying that "Every great revolution demands a great idea to be its center of action; to furnish it with both lever and fulcrum for the work it has to do."[1]

What was it that Rauschenbusch, A German-American Christian socialist and anti-capitalist found in Giuseppe Mazzini?

The answer will provide us with familiar themes as well as with some new motifs.

1. He had experienced the usual (for Rauschenbusch's mentors) transition from an inherited orthodoxy to a more liberal theological base. Mazzini came from an austere and devout Jansenist Catholic family. He moved to a moralistic conception of God as Morality, Justice, Love, Guide to History and teacher of men. Mazzini had a somewhat pantheistic conception of God interchangeable with Law, natural and human. He also had a great reverence for Jesus and a unitarian conception of his Deity.[2]

2. Somewhat like Bellamy, Mazzini believed in the idea of a utopian theocracy emanating directly from the people, leveling all hierarchical arrangements, secular and ecclesiastical. The following quotation suggests something of the intoxicating religion of humanity which informed the Mazzini vision:

> The Holy Church of the Future, the Church of the Free and Equal will give its blessing to every forward step that is taken by the Spirit of Truth. It will be one with the life of Humanity. It will have no popes and no laity, but just believers. All men will be priests with differing functions. And there will be a new heaven and a new earth.[3]

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, op. cit., p.41.

[2] Giuseppe Mazzini, Selected Writings, ed. N. Gangulee (London: Lindsay Drummond, Ltd., 1944), Part 6, "Religious and Moral Outlook," pp. 189-213.

[3] Quoted in, Ignazio Silona, The Living Thoughts of Mazzini, (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939), pp. 20-21.

This groundswell of humanity in a new heaven and a new earth is a typical Enlightenment equivalent of the Kingdom of God. It affirms that emancipation from superstition, hierarchy and all other alien influences will permit the innate goodness and richness of humanity to express itself in the Holy Commonwealth as deep and as broad as the sweep of life itself.

3. Mazzini, 1805-1872, was a contemporary of Karl Marx, 1818-1883. As such he faced the Marxian attack and rejected this French revolution, class struggle, internationalist brand of socialism for his own approach to socialism which was always subordinated to nationality. The de-nationalized socialism of Marx was impossible to Mazzini.

Mazzini wrote to the Italian workers:

> Without a country you have no name, no identity no voice, no rights, no membership in the brotherhood of nations--you remain just the bastards of humanity. Soldiers without a flag, Jews in a world of Gentiles, you will win neither trust nor protection. You will have no sponsors. Do not be misled into trying to achieve your emancipation from an unfair social condition until you have freed your country. You will not succeed in such an effort. Only your country, the blessed land that stretches spacious and rich between the Alps and the Southern rim of Sicily, can realize your hopes for a better lot.[1]

4. Thus Mazzini, though socialist, developed a concept of nationality based on the mission God bestows upon a given people in the larger progress of Humanity. Basically, he sought republican governments on the basis of national unifications, opposing the subordination of national interest to class interest.

He saw this process of unification as an essentially revolutionary struggle against the monarchial, class interests suppressing the upsurge of the peoples' nationalism. It was a though nationality is a necessary state prior to anything higher.

It is difficult to know what component parts of Mazzini's vision influenced Rauschenbusch. There was a common rejection of conventional religion although this was more far-reaching in Mazzini who, formally speaking, ceased to be a Christian. There a common celebration of the upsurge of righteousness among the people insofar as their acquired bondage was thrown off. There a common rejection of Marxism while embracing aspects of socialism. And it may well be that Rauschenbusch's perception of kinship with Mazzini also included something of this appreciation for nationality wholly emancipated from the reactionary nationalism of warring monarchs and Machiavellian diplomats concealing the economic exploitation behind this politico-military maneuvering. It is entirely possible that one who has inwardly experienced the German mentality as Rauschenbusch did can never embrace an internationalism which skips over the destiny of particular nations in this phase of human history. While never succumbing to any of the Hegelian pre-fascist nationalistic Geist, Rauschenbusch may have felt something of the mission which each nation must play in the realization of the Kingdom of God. This, not in terms of an autonomous egcentricity. But, rather, as part of the Kingdom whole.

---

[1] Quoted in Silone, *ibid*., p. 40-41.

Rauschenbusch's position on America was that its character was formed by Christian influence particularly from the free churches and particularly by the Puritans. This gave us a feeling for political democracy which is part of our heritage. Now it is our destiny to move on to industrial democracy as well. God is speaking to us through the crisis of labor exploitation, unequal distribution of wealth, low worker morale, bad health, inequality, growing class distinctions, collapse of the family, a tainted moral atmosphere and the lessening of democracy. Positively the signs are the new social movements beckoning, wooing, calling, beseeching us to fulfill our national destiny.

Also, In Mazzini may have been some cardinal convictions which betrayed Rauschenbusch into the Christ of culture. To Mazzini religion was strictly instrumental to national self-realization. Anyone who believes this is a cultural religionist or a cultural Christian. Clothed in Mazzini's flaming, crusading, Latin passion these convictions sound like the fury of an Amos when, as a matter of fact, they may have been a synthesis of a Romantic nationalism artificially emancipated from the crasser realities of power, enthnocentricity and the pantheistic myths created by Mazzini himself.

On the other hand, there was a sober, monastic kind of integrity in Mazzini which made the chasm between good and evil very vast and the retribution on wrong-doing very ominous. Rauschenbusch's empathy with any sincere prophet was very real.

B. Minor Influences

1. Sidney and Beatrice Webb

Rauschenbusch lived with the Webbs during a trip to England. During this time he studied cooperatives and Fabian socialism. Fabianism arose between 1865-1885 as an alternative to Marxism and Owenism. Marx offered class struggle and revolution after an apocalyptic twist of history delivering the economic apparatus to the messianic working class via the State. On the other hand, in England the working classes were rising to power, the national conscience for social change was gorwing, a democratic state was open to the possibility of reform, freedom of press and assembly permitted searching social criticism and overt organization. Therefore, why wait for the lid to blow off? Socialism starts now whenever the state is accessible to social reform, whenever the capitalist class admits collective bargaining, on the one hand, and state intervention, on the other.

The socialism of Webb is based on the Ricardian theory of rent, a neo-Georgian doctrine, and the growing social conscience of the nation. The research genius of Webb led him to the concept of research on particular evils with a socialist solution to these particularities expressed through legislation.

Laidler summarizes the Fabian attack as follows:

> The mission of the socialist was, therefore, to acquire knowledge by

> means of specialized research into the various manifestations of economic and social life, to acquaint themselves with the machinery of legislation and administration, and to put their knowledge and experience at the disposal of all political agencies.[1]

This was basically Rauschenbusch's approach to the socialist challenge. He once remarked in his 1901 speech on "Dogmatic and Practical Socialism" that "The attitude of the dogmatic socialists reminds me of certain Christians, whom we call Millenarians."[2] Practical socialism is liberal and intelligent, beginning now--like the Fabians. Yet Rauschenbusch placed this in a much more dramatic context, a theory of periodization plus the Kingdom of God.

2. Bull Moose and Theodore Roosevelt

The political climate of Rauschenbusch's mature years was Bull Moose Progressivism. Theodore Roosevelt was president the year Christianity and the Social Crisis was published, namely, 1907. In this book there are four references to President Roosevelt, one of which makes the following statement:

> The present movement for federal and state interference and control over corporations, of which President Roosevelt is the most eminent exponent and leader, is an effort to assert the ownership and mastership of the people and to force these stewards of public powers back into the position of public servants.[3]

Prior to Theodore Roosevelt was Bryan's great campaign in 1896 and after Roosevelt came the climax and, momentarily the end, in Woodrow Wilson. The key years of Rauschenbusch's career in social Christianity were spent when liberal politics had able, colorful leadership. At that time it appeared that popular democracy was finally putting political pressure on the money interests. Rauschenbusch quotes the Boston Common as saying that the Progressive Platform of 1912 was "an adaptation of the more imminent teachings of socialism for middle class neophytes," and added, "out from among the lowly and despised once more has come a message of guidance for humanity."[1]

---

[1] Harry W. Laidler, Social-Economic Movements (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1948), p. 185.

[2] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 205. [3] P. 386.

3. E. A. Ross, Sociologist

The pioneer sociologist of the University of Wisconsin is the most quoted social scientist in the works of Rauschenbusch. In Christianizing the Social Order Ross's little book, Sin and Society is quoted four times and The Changing Chinese is quoted once. These books combine the wrath of a crusading reformer with the social scientist's sense of corporateness in our evil-doing. One of the chapters which Rauschenbusch quotes is "Sinning by Syndicate" suggesting the organized, societal fashion in which sin takes place. Other passages show how private money interests are back of public corruption, how big business gags investigations and criticisms, and the manner in which professors teach an amoral, triumphant lawlessness to college students. The quotation from the book on China argues that China's familistic culture has never created a public mind which transcends the circumscribed domestic circle.

Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia is the only other American sociologist quoted by Rauschenbusch. The reference is also a reformist reference to the power of the concentrated wealth of the time.

In The Social Principles of Jesus Rauschenbusch affirmed his belief that:

> The development of what is called 'Social Christianity' or 'the social gospel' is a fusion between the new understanding created by the social sciences, and the teachings and moral ideals of Christianity. This combination was inevitable; it has already registered social effects of the highest importance; if it can win the active minds of the present generation of college students, it will swing a part of the enormous organized forces of the Christian church to bear on the social tasks of our American communities and that will help to create the nobler America which we will see by faith.[1]

Against the background of the reformist wrath of Ross and Giddings cast in a social framework, Rauschenbusch could feel a real affinity between Christianity and the social sciences. Today, however, most social scientists would not recognize themselves in the role of reformer with sharp value judgments on social questions cast in a moralistic mould with semi-theological vocabulary. Perhaps more typical of what was coming in social science was William Graham Sumner (1840-1910) of Yale, an ex-minister who was the first American teacher to introduce a clearly defined course in sociology--this in the year 1876. Sumner was a social Darwinian who believed that social change was automatic basic strictly on the ratio of man to land. He wrote a famous essay, "The Absurd Effort to Make the World Over,"[1] which breathed a completely different spirit than that which pervaded the departments at Columbia and Wisconsin. Against this determinism there have always been American social scientists seeing more of an interaction between man and socially conditioning factors. Rauschenbusch quite understandably worked with the latter, particularly before the cult of objectivity cut the nerve of reformist impulses. Perhaps it was symbolic that the first courses in ethics in theological seminaries tended to be titled, "Christian sociology." In effect, this was what Ross and Giddings were presenting, too. Later a man like Charles A. Ellwood expressed his Quaker concerns in somewhat the same fashion. The theological presuppositions were definitely liberal but the social concern was what Rauschenbusch noted, a fusion of social science (in its infant stage) and the moral ideals of Christianity.

---

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 396.

[2] Rauschenbusch, op. cit., p. 196.

In any case, one has the impression that Rauschenbusch was more influenced by historical studies, theological, Biblical and patristic, than by social sciences, per se. Also, by writers more specifically focused on the economic problem.

---

[1] War and Other Essays (Yale University Press: New Haven, 1911), pp. 208-210.

As for evolution, it clearly registered in the thought of Rauschenbusch in terms of a gradualistic, developmental, organic view of history. The Origin of Species appeared in 1859 and the Descent of Man in 1871. Hence, they were available to him. But he had no heart for an impersonal, ruthless, social Darwinianism. Hence, Ross and Giddings and silence and/or rejection of Sumner.

This concludes our survey of the thinkers along socio-economic lines infected with the spirit of idealism. There is a unified rejection of orthodoxy and support for Enlightenment rationalism integrated with Christian idealism. There is a unified rejection of capitalistic-industrialism and support for varying degrees of socialism, the latter essentially Fabian. There is a rejection of political orthodoxy and support for Bull Moose, essentially a left-wing New Deal answer. There is a rejection of static conceptions of society and a support for dynamic concepts of social change in the name of high religion and social science. All this provided a remarkable epoch in American history. Save for the Puritan theocracy in colonial New England or Penn's utopian dreams for Pennsylvania, this epoch contained more social excitement than any previous time in American history. In terms of society as a whole, emancipated from a more churchly theocratic perspective, there is nothing to rival these social hopes, however naive and utopian they may have been. It was a powerful liberal Zeitgeist.

In many ways there was a remarkable unity among the theologians, the Biblical scholars, the historians and the socio-economic thinkers of Rauschenbusch's era. This is not to say that Rauschenbusch was predetermined by this phalanx of liberals to follow in their pathway. But, at almost every point Rauschenbusch found liberal materials to utilize in his Kingdom of God ethics.

The theology of institutions is the greatest and most enduring legacy of liberalism to Rauschenbusch and to subsequent generations. Never again will it be possible to analyze human sin in purely individualistic and subjective terms. Never again can Christian witness be conceived without taking this into consideration. Theological contexts can be quite varied for this continuing and permanently valid insight.

However, these liberal origins came at a certain moment in the Western world and at a certain point in Rauschenbusch's development. The fact that Henry George who was running for mayor of New York had a religious basis for a keen social criticism was a unique development of the New York pastorate. He was thus moulded by a particular kind of liberalism within the broad liberal Zeitgeist.

The encounter of liberalism with pietism, sectarianism and (in the next chapter) transformationism created a fresh synthesis with many permanent tensions.

Liberalism as a sharp criticism of culture remains in tension with liberalism which moves toward the Christ-of-culture emphasis.

Liberalism as Christ-of-culture remains in tension with the sectarian, pietist and puritan feeling for conflict with the culture.

The discipleship response to Jesus remains in tension with the response in terms of complicated structural social analysis leading to change.

Liberal utopianism remains in conflict with the tragic sense of history in the sectarians.

The liberal emphasis upon the role of rationality remained in tension with the sectarian feeling for irrational factors in culture.

The liberal quest for socialism remained in tension with a pietist critique of the personal morality of socialists.

These and other tensions remained to dramatize the fact that Rauschenbusch's enthusiastic embrace of liberalism had not dissolved part of the legacy of sectarianism and pietism. Moreover, these tensions remained as an agenda for future critiques and reconstructions of Christian social concern.

Liberalism helped to originate the ethics of Rauschenbusch. But it was a creative, free selection of materials from particular liberal tributaries. And it took place in relation to other original influences from the other motifs.

CHAPTER V

THE INFLUENCE OF TRANSFORMATIONISM

The transformationists have a positive and hopeful attidue toward culture based on the oneness of creation and redemption, of incarnation and atonement. From this theological base the transformationists pioneered in the development of Christian socialism on the positive side and a keen attack on Mammonistic materialism on the other--both of the latter themes are prominent in Rauschenbusch.

The transformationists are difficult to classify. There is, first of all, the basic division used in this chapter between the Catholics and Calvinists. The Catholics are not theological liberals. They are Anglican, Trinitarian and Sacramentarian. Ethically they are anti-capitalist, but monarchial and conservative in politics and aristocratic in their view of stratification of society. Yet it is precisely at the point of origins that the Catholic transformationists like Maurice and Kingsley are important. They were pioneers in using the term socialism and affirming essentially socialist principles. Rauschenbusch was impressed by their exposure of the horrors of capitalism and their rejection of ruthless competition.

The Calvinist transformationists, Ragaz and Kutter, could also be classified with the liberals. They are not classified this way because their emphasis on transformationism is intense and some of their theological affirmations are not couched in liberal language.

In the case of Ragaz there is an explicit identification with left-wing

Protestantism which introduces a sectarian motif into his analysis.

In the entire history of Christian ethics it is hard to find a more powerful indictment of money, wealth, economic exploitation, the grinding effects of competition and the terrible evil of ruthless competition.

It is also quite possible that something of Rauschenbusch's transformationist origins took place in the American Zeitgeist with what Winthrop Hudson calls evangelicalism. By this he means the legacy of early American Protestantism for the permeation of society with Christian moral sanctions. This side of Protestantism was activist and socially responsible as over against an individualistic pietism. Yet in specific documentation, the evidence points in the direction of the four Christian socialist transformationists dealt with in this section.

By way of the methodology of demonstration, it is not possible to locate any of this emphasis in the family background. In terms of the Zeigeist this is a good example of a situation where the American Zeitgeist was able to mediate a general background of activism and transformationism as suggested above. Yet it is Rauschenbusch's European background which mediated the specific influence of the English Anglican Catholics and the Swiss Reformed socialists. Without Rauschenbusch's awareness of thought currents in America and Europe he might well have missed the impact of these men.

Rauschenbusch explicitly identifies himself with these men and hails the outstanding contribution they are making to the new solidaristic, Kingdom of God ethics. Especially with Ragaz and Kutter he finds a prophetic fire which moves him. While Rauschenbusch was a Christian socialist it is clear that he is never as completely devoted to political socialism as men like Ragaz and Kutter. The Rochester prophet reached maturity in a political climate where Bull Moose Progressivism was the only really live option located left of center in America. His tension with socialism at the point of personal morality and at the point of a fanatical dogmatism likely restrained an all-out idenification with the then prevailing socialist movements in this country. But in the sense to be defined later in this section Rauschenbusch was a Christian socialist.

The evidence in terms of books and authors is rather clear. Rauschenbusch read the transformationists in England and Switzerland with great delight. It is doubtful if any of these four men moulded his original thinking on social questions as Henry George was able to do into the early New York days. The Christian socialists and transformationists arrived after his quest for a more corporate ethics was started. But it is highly probable that the amplification and extension of these first origins in the direction of corporate analysis took place at the hands of the transformationists. This extension was particularly in the direction of a much closer identification of socialism with the prophetic outpouring of God's mercy and wrath in their time. This socialist Kairos became another element in the meaning of the Kingdom of God.

The pessimism about capitalism, the optimism about socialism and the identification of the Kingdom with socialist movements became very characteristic themes in Rauschenbusch and the social gospel. It is also possible that here Rauschenbusch could have found theological foundations somewhat superior to certain elements which he had appropriated from the Kantian-Ritschlian orientation. The quotation on the next page suggests that he was aware that social concern could be expressed in the context of a high church kind of Christianity.

In any case, the transformationists amplified Rauschenbusch ethics even though they did not start him in this direction. Ragaz and Kutter were closest to his own background and outlook. Maurice and Kingsley, however, provided a number of themes which fit with his system of thought.

A. Catholic Transformationists

1. F. D. Maurice

Rauschenbusch has a lofty conception of the role of the pioneer Christian socialists of England. In his Yale lectures he said:

> When the early Christian Socialists, Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley, first asserted solidaristic ideas on theology and social questions, they justly felt that they were preaching a new and prophetic gospel in the midst of a Babylon of competitive selfishness. The trend of things is strikingly brought out by the contrast between their lonely position in the revolutionary year of 1848 and the Anglican Congress of 1908, where Christian Socialism was in possession of the platform and only Lord Cecil made a stand against it. It is significant that, so far as the social gospel is concerned, the High Church section has become Broad, and some of its intellectual leaders are weaving solidaristic ideas into their most sacramental and ecclesiastical doctrines.[1]

It is not quite clear whether Maurice would recognize himself in solidaristic ideas bathed in Enlightenment theology although Rauschenbusch is surely correct in seeing a radical attack on individualism, on the vices of industrialism and capitalism and a transformationist ethic.

Elsewhere he quotes Maurice against competition with the preface: "One of the finest minds of England in the Victorian Age."[2] And, again, he stands "by common consent as one of its finest products"[3]--the reference being to Maurice as one of the finest products of his generation. Moreover, Sharpe indicates that he discovered Maurice during the highly dynamic days of the New York pastorate.[4] Obviously, then, Rauschenbusch had a very high regard for Maurice as one of the towering figures in the start of a socially concerned Christianity. This is true even though the thrust of Maurice takes place in the context of orthodoxy.[5] Rauschenbusch was attracted by the criticism of

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 29.

[2] Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 271.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 417. [4] Sharpe, *op. cit*., p. 197.

[5] H. Richard Niebuhr and Waldo Beach, Christian Ethics (New York: The Ronald Press, 1955), p. 481; stress the theological distance between Maurice and the early formulations of the American social gospel.

Mammonism, the alternative of socialism, both understood as solidaristic in its negative and positive meaning. Vivid symbol of the fact that Maurice is building a social ethic on a different foundation than free church Christianity, is the polemical character of his book, The Kingdom of Christ, particularly against Quakerism. In fact, the subtitle of the book is, "Hints to a Quaker." Alec Vidler's study of Maurice, Witness to the Light, gives an intensely Anglican interpretation of the work of Maurice.

Nevertheless, there were elements in Maurice which spoke to Rauschenbusch. These persist despite the fact that Maurice was Anglican, not sectarian; Trinitarian not Unitarian; sacramentarian not moralist; apostolic successionist not laity-centered; intensely English, not American or German.

1. There was a radical attack on materialism

At the heart of England's industrial system he saw war in the form of competition. Competition as the law of the universe, Maurice candidly labeled as a lie.

Regarding materialism he wrote to his son:

> It seems to me sometimes as if the slow disease of money-getting and money-worship, by which we have been so long tormented, must end in death, and though I do believe inwardly and heartily in a regenerative power for Societies as well as individuals, the signs of its active presence here are not yet manifest to me. Neither in Conservatism nor Liberalism as I find them here, can I see what is to make the dead bones stir and live.[1]

The answer was not patchwork liberal reform nor Marxism but a radical, revolutionary return to the Kingdom and Kingship of Christ.

He looked with dismay at the growing cleft between the rich and poor, the cynicism of the rich matching the brooding discontent of the poor. He wrote an article in Fraser's Magazine dealing with labor conditions which created great excitement along with Kingsley's slashing attack on sweatshops entitled, Cheap Clothes and Nasty.

---

[1] Quoted in Maurice B. Reckitt, Maurice to Temple (London: Faber and Faber, 1950), p. 97.

These were characteristic themes in social gospel criticism: the inherent evils of capitalism and the depth of the crisis; the poison spewing out from the mouth of a money-grabbing culture; the exploitation of labor and the suffering of people generally under capitalist industrialism. This was the same apparently across theological lines.

2. A radical socio-ethical criticism of the church

Coming from an Anglican this is a more serious matter than from a free church with a more permanent criticism of religious institutions, per se.

In any case, Maurice saw that the church did not apply a standard to judge the institutions of society but rather providing reasons for accepting them. He did not hesitate to refer to "the horrible apostasy of the church."[1] He attacked the unsocial Christians in the church and the unchristian socialists out of the church. The unsocial Christians based man's relation to Christ on external rites, substituting religion for Christ and took no responsibility for the social life of humanity. The unchristian socialists, on the other hand, are inclined to base society on man's animal nature, and to make common self-interest the ground for social action.

His profoundly Christian criticism calls for the church to be the church, uniting men on the great events of Christ's life, death, resurrection and ascension. At present it is buried under pseudo-religion and mammonism. Yet it is still visible under all that covers it.

He definitely rejected the sectarian approach the church but developed a concept of Catholic and Protestant elements interacting.

3. The use of the term socialism and an affirmation of essentially socialist principles

---

[1] Quoted in H. R. Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 222.

James Luther Adams points out in his Encyclopedia Brittanica article on Christian socialism that the term was first used by the Maurice-Kingsley-Ludlow group of Broad Churchmen. And, that the term denoted:

> . . . a wide variety of social doctrines and movements which have attempted to give a basic, structural application to the social principles of Christianity. In the nineteenth century the term socialism in this context was employed in a certain loose sense, denoting in opposition to laissez-faire individualism, a Christian demand for some form of political or social action in the interest of all the people. Christian socialism usually did not demand the common ownership and control of the means of production and exchange.[1]

In the case of Maurice, he apparently did have in mind the bold use of the term. In a letter to Ludlow, written in 1850 he wrote:

> It is a great thing not to leave people to poke out our object and proclaim it with infinite triumph: "Why you are Socialists in disguise." 'In disguise': not a bit of it. There it is staring you in the face upon the title page! . . . This is the fair play, which the English people like, and which will save us from a number of long prefaces, paraphrases, apologetical statements which waste time when one wants to be getting down to business.[2]

As for the texture of this socialism, he wrote in the Tracts on Christian Socialism:

> The socialism I speak of is that of Owen, Fourier, Louis Blanc—of the Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, who have fraternized with them or produced systems of their own.[3]

Apparently, state ownership of the means of production was not the key. Rather the key is the action of working class associations in doing something for themselves.

Fifty years later Walter Rauschenbusch was ready to go beyond this into a more explicit form of state socialism. Yet he retained Maurice's desire to socialize Christians and to Christianize socialists; he retained the larger sense of socialism as meaning the whole social task of Christianity; he retained it as a rejection of laissez-faire; he retained the call for social and political action. Perhaps above all, he retained the term itself, launched as Christian socialism by Maurice himself.

---

[1] Encyclopedia Brittanica (Chicago: Encyclopedia Brittanica, Inc., n.d.) p. 639.

[2] Quoted in Reckitt, op. cit., p. 84. [3] Ibid., p. 86.

4. The use of the Kingdom of God as a major motif

In a letter to Ludlow he said that "the Kingdom of Heaven is to me the great practical existing reality which is to renew the earth . . . to preach the Gospel of that Kingdom the fact that it is among us, and is not to be set up at all, is my calling and my business."[1]

He thus has the same central focus as the later social gospel thinkers. As an orthodox Anglican he rejected the idea of the Kingdom as the ultimate consequence of sanctified temporal effort. It has been planted by the mighty acts of God, alike of redemption and creation. The purpose of the social movement is not to change society by some clever suggestion of the social leaders, but to find its foundation in the Living God.

5. The use of the Kingdom in a transformationist sense

As a transformationist Maurice focused not on sin but on Christ the King and His Kingdom. The devil is not in control. Christ is in control. The accent is on the positive not the negative. Hence, the time is now. This does not mean accomodation and compromise. It does mean a radical change when Christ becomes King, when Christ the Living Word of God moves forward into unredeemed human life. By taking our gaze away from obsessive attention to sin and turning to the Word, there are no real limits to what we can accomplish. Again and again, Maurice makes it clear that this is not the Christ of culture (although he makes a large allowance for historical particularities such as nationality) but the Christ who converts and redeems society. His will and reign move forward.

---

[1] Quoted in Gilbert Clive Binyon, The Christian Socialist Movement in England (London: Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1931), p. 88.

As the social movement progressed after Maurice, it retained the transformationist vision but with considerably less protection against cultural Protestantism. This is the Johannine vision. It has burned brightly from Maurice to Temple despite the simple synoptic-Enlightenment Christianity of Rauschenbusch and the dramatic Pauline vision of the Niebuhrs.

There is, however, an ominous note lurking around the Isle of Patmos. There John or his namesake exchange transformation for wrath and judgment! Every transformationist must look carefully to see if Patmos is on his route.

2. Charles Kingsley

"If Maurice was the man of vision, the Moses of Christian Socialism," writes Charles Raven, "Kingsley with his power of tongue and pen can claim to be its Aaron."[1]

The discussion on Maurice was introduced with a long quotation from Rauschenbusch noting solidaristic motifs in both Maurice and Kingsley, noting the contrast between their loneliness in 1848 and the greater responses of the social gospel in the early part of the twentieth century. For Rauschenbusch, as in our own time, to quote Maurice is to quote Kingsley: they are almost always placed together in the Moses-Aaron relationship. For example, he refers to "the little group of early Christian socialists in England, led by Maurice, Kingsley and Hughes," who "stand by common consent in the history of that generation as one of its finest products, but at that time they were bitterly assailed and misunderstood."[2] Moreover, Rauschenbusch quoted Kingsley ("Competition means death; cooperation means life.")[3] And Sharpe notes that Kingsley's novels, Alton Locke and Yeast were among the provocative literature of social protest known to Rauschenbusch.[1] Both Maurice and Kingsley were discovered during the early New York days. Bodein also agrees that Kingsley was among the list of major influences.[2]

---

[1] Charles E. Raven, Christian Socialism 1848-1854 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1920), pp. 93-94.

[2] Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, op. cit., p. 417.

[3] Ibid., p. 271.

The opening quotation from Canon Raven properly suggests that the difference between Kingsley and Maurice was functional rather than ideological or theological. He was a high church Anglican, a pastor and preacher, a moralist, a reformer and socialist. As a man of letters he was varied and gifted in his abilities, being a novelist, poet, essayist and historian.

Kingsley's true status as a polemical man of letters is controversial. For one thing he was not primarily a man of letters: this was instrumental to his reformist and moralistic concerns. Some poor scorn on his literary abilities. Raven, while critical, places him with Dickens in bringing about an awakening on grave social issues.[3] Though incessentantly shrill his novels of social protest had a power of description which brought to the English mind and heart the ugly squalor and depressing dullness of the new industrialism. Alton Locke is a "tract writ large," an expansion of Cheap Clothes and Nasty a genuine tract which cried out against the newly enthroned Mammonism. In the words of Raven:

> Kingsley's supreme gift is his power of description. No single writer among the masters of English speech is his equal as a painter of scenery; whether it be the splendour of the tropical forest or the squalor of the sweater's den, the thronging life of the quays of Alexandria or the futile frenzy of a riot in the Fens, his pictures live before us. With the imagination of a poet he can visualize the myriad details of their atmosphere, with the eloquence of an orator he can reproduce in us their every tone and hue.[4]

Continuing, Raven observes:

> We share his acute sensibility to sights and sounds and smells; our souls respond with his to the impression which they combine to create. And this supreme gift is nowhere put to nobler use than when he is forcing us to enter haunts of vice and heroism, of sordid misery and patient

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 123. [2] Bodein, op. cit., p. 101.

[3] Raven, op. cit., p. 173. [4] Ibid., p. 172.

> martyrdom to whose existence we would fain be blind. . . . Much as his might declaim over the falacies of his economics and the injustice of his strictures upon society, they could not deny the pathos and the passion, nor save in trivial details, the truth of his pictures. He tore away the veil from the eyes of the prudish and the pharisaical: he revealed to them the horror of competitive industrialism in all its nakedness: they might shudder and protest; but they could not wholly forget. Though they might refuse to accept his remedy without inquiry, they could not refuse to notice and investigate it.[1]

This, then, was a Christian reformer informed by keen research into prevailing social conditions plus a skill in writing fiction which would make these facts vivid and real. Theologically and ethically he was with Maurice: the radical attack on materialism, a radical socio-ethical criticism of the church, the use of the term socialism and the affirmation of essentially socialist principles, the use of the Kingdom of God as a major motif.

As the Aaron of the movement, Kingsley belongs with Bellamy and George despite the vast theological and even ethical chasm between the Americans and himself at this point. The American liberal and radical finds it difficult to combine a juggernaut of anti-capitalist criticism with conservative politics, monarhcial prejudice and a modified aristocratic view of stratification.

Despite this fact Rauschenbusch and the men around him responded primarily to social critics and prophets writing in some recognizable sense as Christians. Hence, the Kingsley novels Alan Locke and Yeast where the Anglican Christian conscience was present. Here was an exposure of hideous poverty, the futility of almsgiving, the hypocrisy of the poor law which he described as "an ingenious means of keeping a poor man a slave without starving him into revolution," the right to labor and the fruits of labor and the necessity for scientific farming without which the country is a desert and the city a crowded stye.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 172.

It was precisely this sort of thing to which Rauschenbusch responded: the exposure of raw capitalism and the rejection of competition as the law of life. All through the American social gospel movement was a radically critical view of the pathological effects of capitalistic industrialism, usually known as Mammonism. The inner core of this perspective was based on the cumulative effect of descriptive studies in fiction and non-fiction, pastoral experiences with people _qua_ people, and the corporate defeats of the church in urban industrialism, a legacy still with us in 1957. Kingsley's writings were a part of the mountain of evidence available for social criticism and righteous indignation.

The weakness of both Maurice and Kingsley was, in part, the weakness of Rauschenbusch. Both lacked a base in mass movements. Maurice and Kingsley came on the scene at the end of the Chartist movement. Max Beer described them as "leaders and officers without any army behind them."[1] Their knowledge of the labor and cooperative movements was very limited. Kingsley was more oriented to political action than Maurice but neither had roots in functional or ideological organizations with a deep foundation in mass currents of thought and action. Rauschenbusch had a much more realistic knowledge of these mass movements and also an intention to have the church related to them. But, he, too, never got to inner dynamics of social movements since his role was more strictly that of teacher, preacher, writer and forum leader.

The contribution of Maurice and Kingsley, however, was primarily in another direction. Vedder has suggested their role as follows:

> Both Chartism and Christian socialism disappeared for more than a generation, and for substantially the same reason in both cases: they appealed to people unorganized, and at that time incapable of being effectively organized. But Christian Socialism, before its disappearance, accomplished one thing of no small importance: it destroyed in England that hostility between advanced political and social ideas and established

---

[1] Quoted in William Dale Morris, The Christian Origins of Social Revolt (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1949), p. 179.

> religion, which has prevailed on the Continent between Socialism and Christianity, to the mutual injury of both. Maurice and Kingsley introduced socialistic ideas among a wide circle of Christians, both clergy and laity, who but for them would never have listened to the new theories.[1]

Thus Maurice and Kingsley prepared the way for Rauschenbusch's more mature thinking later on. This is Catholic prophetism in its denunciations and negativisms. It is Catholic transformationism in its hopes, however tenuous and inadequately structured. This weakness was to be corrected by Catholic transformationists such as Anglican William Temple. Shining through all the work of Kingsley was a rich sense of the solidarity of mankind, a thought very central to Rauschenbusch. In his sermon at Bedford in 1855 on Public Spirit, Kingsley used the text from I Corinthians 12:25-26: "That there should be no division in the body; but that the members should have the same care, one of the another. And whether one member suffer, all suffer with it; or whether one member behonoured, all rejoice with it." Commenting on this truth Kingsley declared:

> . . . For your being townsmen of this place is not a mere accident depending on your living in one house instead of another. It is a spiritual matter; it is a question of eternity. Your souls and spirits influence each other; your tastes, opinions, tempers, habits, make those of your neighbors better or worse; you feel it in yourselves daily. Look at it as a proof that whether you will or not, you are one body, of which all members must more or less suffer and rejoice together; that you have a common weal, a common interest; that God has knit you together; that you cannot part yourselves even if you will; and that you can be happy and prosperous only by acknowledging each other as brothers, and by doing to each other as you should do unto you.
>
> St. Paul is saying, 'If you neglect the poor, you neglect yourself; if you degrade the poor, you degrade yourself. His poverty, his carelessness his immorality, his dirt, his ill-health, will punish you; for you and he are members of the same body, knit together inextricably for weal or woe, by the eternal laws according to which the Lord Jesus Christ constituted human society; and if you break those laws they will avenge themselves.[2]

From this rich sense of social solidarity Kingsley erected a foundation for subsequent generations to build upon. Rauschenbusch was in that company of builders.

---

[1] Henry C. Vedder, Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914),pp. 201-202.

[2] Charles Kingsley, Sermons for the Times, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1884), pp. 301-302.

3. Emile de Laveleye

Already in the Anabaptist-sectarian section reference has been made to Emile de Laveleye, the Catholic economist of Belgium whose writings influenced Rauschenbusch so greatly. In the previous section mention was made of what was essentially an anti-Catholic book by this Catholic author, a pattern reminiscent of Lord Acton. This book, Protestantism and Catholicism In Their Bearing Upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations shows that democratic free Protestant churches have affinity for free institutions while despotic Roman churches have affinity for despotism. This little book, however, was less famous than Laveleye's solid volume, De La Properte et de ses Formes Primitives published by Felix Alcan in Paris in 1901. Rauschenbusch refers to the final closing paragraph of this book in Christianizing the Social Order adding in the footnote that these are "the closing words of the great book" by "the eminent Belgian economist Emile de Laveleye."[1] In Christianity and the Social Crisis he again refers to him as "the eminent Belgian economist," quoting the statement that "If Christianity were taught and understood conformably to the spirit of its Founder, the existing social organism could not last a day."[2]

Despite Laveleye's anti-Roman Catholicism, the theory of property developed in De la Properte et de ses Formes Primitives contributed to Rauschenbusch's transformationist conceptions. The reason for this is that the book is an anthropological defense of the existence of primitive collectivism from which mankind fell into individualism.[3] Therefore, since collectivism is man's natural state, the return to this communal form is both possible and desirable if not ultimately inevitable. Hence, the transformation of capitalism into its original communistic Imago Deo.

---

[1] P. 325. [2] P. 89.

[3] P. vii.

The fall from collectivism was threefold: (1) By the time of Tacitus and Caesar some families already had more slaves and power than their neighbors, leading to intensive cultivation of the land;[1] (2) The Roman church was a part of the fall because the church was the sole exception to the rule that individuals could not dispose of their land without the consent of the community. Thus more and more people gave their land without the consent to the church. The abbies became co-possessors of the public lands, against the organization of primitive collectivism. By the nineth century one-third of all lands in Gaul belonged to the clergy.[2] Laveleye's sturdy anti-Romanism is again expressed in the church as the agent of individualistic inheritance practices leading to sub-communal ecclesiastical collectivism; (3) The people finally have no power to resist the Royal families and feudal Lords as common lands become the domain of the sovereigns. All cultivation of land becomes servile. The free farmer of the second century becomes the serf of the nineth century.[3]

In addition to affirming an original collectivism and then tracing the Fall with the church was one of the devils, Laveleye affirms a doctrine of natural law. Here he repeats over and over again that there is a natural instinct of justice and an innate notion of law. Lest one might think these are autonomous secular ideas, Laveleye goes on to affirm, with Fichte, that Christianity has within its breast a power of renewal which can become a force in the State as it has heretofore been among individuals. The equalitarian ideas of the Gospel must penetrate institutions and laws.[4]

Against this background of primitive collectivism, natural law and Christian equalitarianism seeking transformation, Laveleye calls for a re-tooling of our ideas of property. Here we must avoid starting with the Roman theory of property with its excessive protection of individual property rights via inheritance and other aristocratic notions leading to inequality.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 408. [2] Ibid., p. 409. [3] Ibid., p. 410.

[4] Ibid., p. xxv.

Today younger nations like America and Australia have a wonderful opportunity to by-pass the influence of the Roman Empire and go back to the real founding fathers in more ancient and primitive times. Here one finds that only temporary use of property is ever conceded to individuals. For, the true basis of property is the community, not the individual. This is buttressed by extensive materials from Russia (especially the Russian agrarian mir with its native collectivism) India, Java, Germany, Scandinavia, Belgium Holland, and Switzerland.[2]

Today, according to Laveleye, the sub-stratum of this primitive collectivism supported by natural law and Christian ethics seeks to re-express itself. Individualism and hereditary approaches to property must go. Actually this is not an attack on property since property is one of the conditions of liberty. It is, in fact, the only way to make the distribution and use of property widespread and far-reaching. While there is no single final form of property which is best it will, roughly speaking, be some collectivism pattern.[3]

Thus, here is another transformationist influence in Rauschenbusch's tutelage from Catholicism even when it is anti-Roman and pro-free church. Now the evidence was historical and anthropological for an anti-capitalist prosocialist social gospel.

In passing one cannot help but being impressed by the range of Rauschenbusch's reading in the key modern languages and among a wide variety of books and disciplines. No matter what the writer's specialty, his book was usually in some kind of religious context. Secularization of thought was not as widespread in his era. Perhaps this is one of the reasons that Marx's bald antheism made the whole Marxist corpus of material outside of his real interest. In any case, Laveleye's De la Properte et de ses Formes Primitives was one of the real influences in his life.

---

[1] Ibid., p. xxvi. [2] Ibid., p. 6.

[3] See Chapter XXVI in Theory of Property, especially p. 559.

The transformationism of Laveleye is clear in the following quotation from another writing:

> The proletarians have been detached from and will return to Christianity when they begin to understand that it brings them freedom and equal rights, whereas atheistic materialism consecrates their slavery and sacrifices them to pretended natural laws. By a complete misapplication of ideas, the religion of Christ, transformed into a temporal and sacerdotal institution, has been called in as the ally of caste, despotism, and the ancient regime to sanction all inequalities. The Gospel, on the contrary, is the good news to the poor--the announcement of the advent of that Kingdom when the humble shall be lifted up and the disinherited shall possess the earth.[1]

This is the crypto-sectarianism of the Catholic Laveleye!

B. Calvinist Transformationists

It is natural for Rauschenbusch to have a more profound encounter with the German-speaking Christian socialists of the Continent--in this case Herman Kutter, the Savonarola of Zurich and his fellow-townsman, Leonhard Ragaz. Few tributes are more glowing than that of Rauschenbusch in Christianizing the Social Order in the kind of footnote which acknowledges far more than a passing quotation:

> In the following pages I am deeply indebted to the inaugural address of Leonhard Ragaz, 'Zur gegenwarten Umgestaltung des Christentums,' published in Neue Wege, Basel, October, 1909. Professor Ragaz is one of the most brilliant preachers of Switzerland, professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Zurich, together with Kutter one of the most eminent leaders of Christian socialism in Switzerland, and all together one of the finest examples of the new type of Social Christianity that I have met.[2]

Later on in this same volume Rauschenbusch has another footnote:

Faith in a new social order is so powerful a breeder of religion that

---

[1] Quoted in Harry W. Laidler, op. cit., p. 729. [2] P. 117.

> great bodies of men who in theory scorn and repudiate the name of religion, in practice show evidence of possessing some of the most powerful instincts and motives of religion.
>
> This is the message of the brilliant book of Kutter of Zurich, 'Sie Mussen,' which has been edited in English by Rufus W. Weeks, and published by the Cooperative Printing Company of Chicago. Richard Heath has summed up all the teachings of Kutter in 'Social Democracy: Does it Mean Darkness or Light?' Letchworth, England, 1910.[1]

Here, at once, we note some interesting relationships. Richard Heath, the English non-conformist, was the author of the Captive City of God, one of the all-time greats on the bookshelf of the Rochester prophet. This same Richard Heath translated and interpreted Kutter to the English speaking world. On the other hand, Rauschenbusch's books were translated into German by Leonhard Ragaz. These men not only had an affinity for one another; they also expressed this through inter-cultural exchanges via translations.

Ragaz, be it noted, was Brunner's predecessor in the chair of theology at Zurich; and, along with Kutter, represented the type of liberal theologian against whom Karl Barth directed much of his polemical fire. These men were cultural Christians, seeking that fulfillment of culture in Christ via some socialistic change. In Barth's Die Protestantische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert there are a number of references to both men as a part of cultural Protestantism of which the following is typical:

> Without any breach, without any Luciferian revolt and downfall, a remarkable pietism very gradually discovered its automatic identity with a cultural Protestantism. It has attempted to say through the simple equation of Christianity with real worldliness and the equation of the church with the state, what Schleiermacher always wanted to say: a pietism, in which one sees the monergism of the Kingdom of God in the sense of Herman Kutter, but also the lay-Christian activism in the sense of Leonhard Ragaz and unmistakeably expressed in the spirituality of our day.[2]

Thus, Ragaz and Kutter represented what Barth and Brunner rejected. The heroes of Rauschenbusch became the scapegoats of Continental theology in the next generation even though the legacy of socialism was not rejected by Barth and Brunner. What was rejected was the older framework for Christian socialism.

---

[1] Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, op, cit., p. 122.

[2] Karl Barth, Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert (Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag., 1947), pp. 544-545.

Because many of the basic convictions of Kutter and Ragaz were similar, some of their common convictions will be outlined. Then we shall look at some of the representative works of each man in order to receive any unique emphasis which they may contribute to our understanding of Rauschenbusch.

Common convictions of Kutter and Ragaz:

1. The central truth of the Bible is the Kingdom of God, the earthly reign of God embracing all mankind.[1]

2. The Kingdom of God is coming primarily through socialism in spite of the professed anti-religious basis: the atheism of the socialists is a hidden confession of the living God.[2]

3. Christians are called to the creation of community. Totalitarian movements represent our scourging as this community seeks to come to fruition.[3]

4. Sin is supremely expressed in capitalistic Mammonism, a corporate materialism which has penetrated the entire culture.[4]

5. The Kingdom comes outside of the church and in spite of the church. The church is apostate and, in any case, institutionalizes something really which cannot be institutionalized, namely, the Kingdom of God.[5]

In this list are convictions which reappear in Rauschenbusch who accepts all of them in principle while softening the impact of several of them especially the apostasy of the church and socialism as the bearer of the Kingdom. On the latter point Rufus Weeks interprets Kutter (in the translator's introduction to They Must) as believing that "the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus and the cooperative commonwealth forseen and willed by the socialists are one and the same."[1] Weeks goes on to say that "the pioneers of this Great Identification will then stand out as the true leaders of men, however little the mass may now perceive them to be their leaders. . . . The first open and widely published proclamation of this identification was the book, They Must. . . now offered to American readers."[2] Surely Rauschenbusch made this identification but not quite as baldly as did Kutter. Little did either know that this so-called Great Identification was going to be one of this most vulnerable parts of the socialist armour.

---

[1] Herman Kutter, They Must: Or God and the Social Democracy (Chicago: Cooperative Printing Company, 1908), p. 209; Leonhard Ragaz, Le Message revolutionnaire (Zurich: Neuchatel, 1941), p. 13-14.

[2] Kutter, ibid., p. 89; Ragaz, Israel, Judaism and Christianity (London: Victor Gallancz Ltd., 1947), p. 68.

[3] Kutter, ibid., pp. 88-89; Ragaz, Le Message revolutionnaire, op. cit., Chapter IV, "The Kingdom as Community."

[4] Kutter, ibid., pp. 61-63; pp. 120-121; Ragaz, ibid., p. 177.

[5] Kutter, ibid., pp. 93-94, 34, 62-63; Ragaz, ibid., pp. 58-60, Chapter IV, "Israel, Judaism and Christianity."

Let us now survey Kutter and Ragaz for further insight into their position.

1. Hermann Kutter

Already we have referred to Hermann Kutter as the Zurich Savonarola. Richard Heath points out that Kutter's election in 1898 to the ministry of the Neumunster in the city of Zurich and the re-election in 1904 seem to have led to his profound interest in the religious meaning of socialism.[3] To Kutter, Social Democracy (or parliamentary socialism) was something far deeper than a social movement or an economic doctrine. It was, to Kutter, the current form of the ancient struggle for justice which operates, now in open rebellion, now in the secret chambers of the human heart; but always there striving for expression in one of amny valid forms. The flag of Marxism and the party of socialism are not the cause and content of socialism but only the weapons forged to express this deeper passion for justice which is essentially religious.

---

[1] Rufus W. Weeks in Kutter, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

[2] *Ibid.* The American edition of They Must contains a brief advertisement for the book along with Rauschenbusch's *Christianity and the Social Crisis.* Of Kutter's volume it is said, "This is the most startling, thrilling and inspiring contribution to the literature of Christian socialism--truly the voice of a prophet of God." Of Rauschenbusch's book: "The latest and best American book on Christian socialism."

[3] Richard Heath in Hermann Kutter, *Social Democracy: Does it Mean Darkness or Light?* (Letchworth: Garden City Press, Ltd., 1910), pp. 1-2.

In addition to the five major emphases of Kutter shared with Ragaz there are some unique emphases which tend to come through in Rauschenbusch, too. Let us preface this review by pointing out that Kutter was a brilliant stylist, writing flaming impassioned prose which was moving and evangelistic in its appeal to the will. In the more balanced and sweetly reasonable literature of our time (Goals of Economic Life edited by Dudley Ward, for example) or in the paradoxes of crisis theology which describe rather than redeem life there appear to be no equivalent to the prophetic power of a Hermann Kutter crying out in the wilderness of a brash imperialism, a raw capitalism and a tribalistic nationalism.

Here, then, are examples of some issues underscored with special stress:

1. The utter corruption wrought by
Mammon

> Mammon has his Ten Commandments as well as God, and them you have taken to heart: Ye shall have no other gods, no living God but me. Ye shall make no useless conceptions and ideals for yourselves. Ye shall not honor what is in heaven or on earth. For, I, Mammon, am a strong god, visiting vengeance on the children's children or those who neglect me, and rewarding by worshippers with prosperity and riches. Ye shall not speak slightingly of Mammon, for he that so doeth shall not go unpunished. Six days shalt thou do Mammon's business, and all the seventh think of him. Thou shalt honor Mammon that thou mayst live long and prosper and that the securities which he puts into thy hand may rise in value. Ye shall not break your troth with Mammon. Ye shall not steal as much as ye safely can. Ye shall not bring false witness and institute false practices against your neighbor, for such conduct is well pleasing to Mammon. Ye shall covet no other good but gold.[1]

---

[1] Kutter, op. cit., pp. 120-121.

> Mammon has subdued the world; not only the hearts and thoughts of men but their outward condition as well. He has appropriated to himself every invention, every improvement in the field of technical skill. That new knowledge which might have freed men from the brute power of physical laws and made them lords over nature, has become in Mammon's hand a tool to distress them, a slave driver's whip under whose strokes the defenceless masses cringe. The nearer men think that they are approaching the goal of their desires, the more awfully are they deceived. And Mammon has done it all.[1]
>
> Who sets man against man like the beasts of the jungle? Who puts the weapons of murder into their hands? Who makes kings and princes the boon companions of base money-lenders? Who stops their ears so that they cannot hear the cry of the oppressed? Who keeps bringing India to the verge of famine? Who has reduced the Transvaal to a desert? Who daily subverts truth and faith in the people and conscience in the people's servants? Who makes us bear the unspeakable banality of our modern life patiently and unconsciously even, consumed as we are by our own interests?
>
> Mammon.[2]

The concept of Mammon was the re-interpretation of the Biblical term for the sort of all-pervasive idolatry of money which the Christian socialists felt was the key problem of their time. It is interesting that this theme was elaborated without any explicit acknowledgement of debt to Marx. Yet it certainly was a radical expression of the economic factor as the clue to all the mainsprings of human action. Nothing was more characteristic of Rauschenbusch and the men of his era than this emotional attack on Mammonism. It seems a bit shrill and hysterical to us today. But the question persists whether we have found an authentic Christian criticism of the economic order in the admittedly more difficult and complex situation of the middle of the twentieth century.

2. The double-standard of modern civilization

In another burst of righteous indignation, Kutter declared:

> . . . The anonymous is the trump card of modern civilization. A man may be a swindler, but must not be called so; he may visit the brother and wallow in sensuality, but he must never get the name of rake. So long as he keeps out of the columns of the yellow paper he is respectable. Our society makes a parade of morality because it has none; it grows furious over a little scandal, to hide its own great scandal. Its morality is the painted shield of its immorality. And it is this society which pretends to

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

> be shocked at the Social Democrat's conception of law and morality. We know the sources of this indignation and its motive.[1]

Perhaps this awareness of a Pharisaical double-standard is the basis of the somewhat cynical character of the radical attacks made on conventional morality. Nothing creates bitterness more than the feeling of lofty moral pretensions concealing inner decay: the outside of the cup is clean the inside laden with bacteria.

3. The priority and primacy of concrete historical movements over against their ideological rationalization

Kutter had a strong sense of the creative role of revolutionary movements. He listed five revolutionary developments as the greatest of history:

1. The prophecy of Israel
2. The advent of Jesus
3. The Reformation
4. The French Revolution
5. Social democracy

Interpreting these revolutionary movements, Kutter observed:

> All these movements have the characteristics of eternal powers . . . ; they all demand the eternal, the lasting in the midst of the passing. They all set themselves in stiffest opposition to their time and thus inaugurate a new era. They have a force in them which will not abide question, an imperative which hardly realizes itself, but which will and must create that to which it impels. They must! And all that the following age does to explain this "must" in wise terms of human philosophy is not explanation.[2]

Kutter then contrasts these movements with their rationalization and includes Christianity in this anti-theological anti-philosophical attack:

> The dogmatic of Christianity is altogether a secondary matter to the faith; the deep philosophical systems of Protestantism are not its strength; the metaphysics of Marx do not define Social Democracy. It has ever been the effort of men to make every new revelation conform to their powers of philosophic expression, but the effort has never been crowned with success, and has often been attended with calamity.[3]

---

[1] Kutter, *ibid.*, p. 176. [2] Kutter, *ibid.*, p. 109. [3] Kutter, *ibid.*

Once again this anti-intellectual attitude is very characteristic of the Rauschenbusch era even though he was a superbly educated man with a real love of learning. In a sense this is a truly Biblical point which, pressed too far, is devastating. But in proper focus it is a powerful insight. Even H. Richard Niebuhr in a post-liberal, post-social gospel mood declares as the first basic conviction of his book The Kingdom of God in America: "Christianity, whether in America or anywhere else but particularly in Protestantism and in America, must be understood as a movement rather than as an institution or series of institutions. It is gospel rather than law; it is more dynamic than static."[1]

4. A powerful sense of the transformationist character of the Gospel for all of the culture

Nothing is more characteristic of Kutter than the belief that inner drive of the Gospel is to radically attack the citadels of sin.

> To believe in Jesus means to say to sin, Thou must cease! and to evil, Thou must fall!
>
> To believe in Jesus means to protest against the powers that are hostile to him.
>
> To believe in Jesus means to be found in the power of the Living God, the God who is coming, who is bringing on the times of his righteousness.
>
> To believe in Jesus means to be ardent for the right against all injustice; to attack evil at its roots without considerations of utility or inability. *It means to make the impossible true, the unattainable possible, the unrealized actual*. For Jesus 'makes all things new.' Jesus has imparted to men the faith in the Kingdom of heaven on earth. What kind of Jesus would he be who should accept as his last word the ideas of *our* church.
>
> To believe in Jesus means to love. But love burns and glows. God is love and God is a consuming fire.[2]

Kutter lashes out at the empty and insipid sense of sin in the church:

> You have apparently no conception of the truth that the evangelical faith was born of the confidence that the power of sin was broken and *must cease*. The evangelical creed! it is only an orthodox sheet of paper for you. You say: 'My Lord and my God.' but where is *your* God? Have you any right to accuse the Roman Church of the worship of idols?[3]

---

[1] H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America*, *op. cit*., pp. xi-xii.

[2] Kutter, *ibid*., p. 87. [3] *Ibid*., p. 146.

Today there is, in Kutter's opinion (1908), a Divinely ordained stirring among the masses. He has a striking sense of God's movement in the very stuff of history.

Here the transformationist dimension of Kutter shines forth with great passion:

> For there is a great stirring in the masses; there is a light and a glow in the depths. Flames are bursting forth. The lowly are raising themselves from the dust, and the mighty are trembling in their seats. Has this come to pass without God, this which agrees so closely with His word? You think God's hand is not in this movement simply because the movement has gotten out of your hands. You surmise that God reveals himself only in the way your own piety can conceive. But what does the Almighty care about your Christianity, so long as you are simply shielding your own impotence behind this name?
>
> Yes, God is speaking today. God is working miracles, but of a different kind from what your traditional Christian formulas and your 'inward' piety can understand--mightier, more elemental, more real. For God is a God of reality. His life cannot be woven out of systems of doctrine. He is bound to no one. As He once left his disobedient people and appealed to the Gentiles who knew him not, so can He today. 'Or is God the God of the Jews alone? Nay, also of the Gentiles.' Rom. 3.
>
> Is He the God of the Christians alone? Nay, also of the Social Democrats. He gives the Spirit to whomsoever He will. Let not the Church forget that.[1]

The transformationist energies of the faith must be given to the Social Democratic movement. God is working in this movement in spite of the church. But how much sounder if the church gave its message and motive to the movement:

> Why, O church, dost thou not rise to give the Social Democracy its baptism of idealism? For to thee the Lord has given this word, the final decisive word for the poor against their oppressors the word of deliverance for a groaning creation, the word of the living God, the word which alone has power to calm clamorous voices and to direct raging passions of men toward the light of truth, the great complete, word of God. This word, thou hast it, O church! The Social Democrats do not have it. They strive and struggle, they rage and rave--the storm wind is driving them. Give them the word! In the name of the living God, join their ranks, preach to them of eternal love; spare not, fear not, advance to meet Mammon in deadly strife. Then behold! the threatening waves of Social Democracy which are dashing against the bulwarks of civilization will subside into the peace and fruitful streams that water the face of the earth. Say no longer, O church, 'This is of Hell and Destruction!' Say rather, 'God wills it.' Then wilt thou ward off what gives us all dread--the revolution!'[2]

---

[1] Kutter, ibid., pp. 88-89. [2] Kutter, ibid., p. 133.

Kutter thus speaks as a Christian wanting a socialism which has the word of God. To him the Gospel comes as a tremendous burst of transformationist energy. Paralysis comes when evil is accepted as necessary, ordained by fate. It is the tomb of civilization to acquiesce in evil. Christianity is apparently a limitless option of redemption if it will seize upon the socialist kairos and shake the foundations of Mammon while erecting the socialist society, the Kingdom of God on earth. Such was the message of Hermann Kutter to whom Rauschenbusch owed a great deal.

2. Leonhard Ragaz

Ragaz was inaugarated professor of systematic theology at Zurich in 1909, two years after Rauschenbusch published Christianity and the Social Crisis. His successor was Emil Brunner. Hence, he is a symbol of the times.

Among the special characteristics of Ragaz are the following:

1. An explicit acknowledgement of historical kinship for left-wing Protestants and other non-conformists both Roman and Protestant

In his book, Der Kampf um das Reich Gottes in Blumhardt Vater und Sohn-und weiter!, Ragaz observes that Christianity is the history of the degeneration of the Kingdom of Christ as well as the struggle against this degeneration. The truth of the Kingdom shows nonetheless through the forms of corruption. God is working through the protestors: Francis of Assisi and John Huss, the Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But God worked here only in part. The hope for earthly impact from Christianity "revived powerfully in the Anabaptist movement, but it was temporarily crushed again by force and disturbed through its own mistakes."[1] Even Pietism, that often abused and backward movement, put this audacious hope of freedom back into circulation only to lapse into a great narrowness. After this came the Blumhardt's "and with them a new day of Christ and the Kingdom of God."[1]

---

[1] Leonhard Ragaz, Der Kamp um das Reich Gottes in Blumhardt Vater und Sohn--und weiter! (Erlenbach-Zurich: Rotapfel-Verlag, 1922), p. 25.

Incidentally, there seems to be no evidence that Rauschenbusch read the Blumhardts.

2. A great sense of conflict between Paul and Jesus

Ragaz believes that in the revolution of the Kingdom of God (and this Kingdom theme prevails at all times) we must return from Paul to Jesus. We have replaced the Kingdom theme with justification; the Sermon on the Mount with the book of Romans. The grandeur and liberty of the Gospel has been replaced by narrowness and Pharisaism. Yes, even Paul is infected with Pharisaism despite his fame as their enemy. We must understand Paul in the light of Jesus and thus rescue Paul from Paulinism.[2]

This theme, of course, is familiar and was hammered home rather powerfully by the social gospel leaders including Rauschenbusch.

3. Judaism and Christianity are the two trunks in which the tree called Israel is split

Israel is the central stream in which the holiness of the Kingdom of God flows. One of the central problems of history is the contrast between Israel and paganism. Paganism is the deification of the world. Paganism is static. Paganism is fate. Israel, on the other hand, is the Living God from whom springs an ever-growing Creation. When paganism blocks this Creationist power, "there rises a volcano that is ever prepared to blow up what is petrified or tending towards apostasy; ever preparing for the Day of God and his fictory."[3] Thus, Creation in this sense is one of the bases of a transformationist hope.

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ragaz, Le Message revolutionnaire, op. cit., p. 230.

[3] Ragaz, Israel, Judaism and Christianity, op. cit., p. 60.

The apostolic community of Christ, born at Pentecost, still stands on the basis of Israel. But too soon and too often this Kingdom-Israel of Christ is replaced by religion, dogma takes the place of the Kingdom message, the credo of orthodoxy takes the place of faith, church replaces community, Caesar merges with Christ, individual salvation replaces redemption, other-worldliness replaces a this-worldly hope. When this happens a remnant remains awaiting the Day of Judgment.

4. Eschatology is joined to Creation as the second foundation to the transformationist hope

Half of what one calls Christianity, believes in God without believing in the Kingdom of God--that new heaven and new earth where justice will dwell; the other half believes in the Kingdom without believing in God. The first of these are responsible for historical tragedy since they do not see the link between faith and the Kingdom. The Judgment announced by Jesus and the prophets has come, and this is the meaning of the crisis which confronts Christianity. Because of this, God can be found among the atheists for the reason that doing the will of God and not the creed is the criterion.[1]

The Kingdom will come in this world. Nature will be transformed. Sickness, and the last enemy, death, will also be conquered when the Kingdom fully comes. Man will help bring in the Kingdom. God is totally responsible for the Kingdom but man is totally responsible for its coming. The Kingdom is not of this world but for this world. Both Baal (nature and the cosmic order) and Caesar (political order) will be saved thereby.[2]

Ragaz, for all his attacks on dogma, uses the second coming conception for much of his analysis. There is a fight between the Kingdom of God and the

---

[1] Ragaz, Le Message revolutionnaire, pp. 176-179.

[2] Ragaz, ibid., Chapter XI, "Cosmic Redemption."

Kingdom of this world. The present world must flounder because he is coming. In the powerlessness of God, the Divine power is being prepared. We must become powerless in order to become victorious. First the lamb and then the lion. Only the Kingdom can vanquish power. Christ comes when the world is overthrown. There is no fixed date since he is always ready. He does not come once and for all. This is true because his coming only inaugarates the new age.[1]

Anti-Christ is the principle of the demonic connected with extraordinary powers. This is embodied in all the social movements that are dominant.

The final implication is that we must in no way collaborate with the world: we must fight it. The Kingdom of God versus the Kingdom of the World--this is our fundamental moral situation.[2]

5. Discipleship in the building of community is the Christian obligation

Ragaz has a conception of response with individual and collective foci. As individuals we are to be disciples of Jesus without servilely imitating him.[3] On the collective side we are called to community, and this transcends any ecclesiastical definition of it.[4] Christian socialism is the most dynamic movement creating community. So strongly did Ragaz believe this that he resigned his position in theology in 1921 in order to enter social movements more directly and less bound by ecclesiastical and academic restrictions.[5]

This concludes the survey of Catholic and Calvinist transformationists: Maurice, Kingsley, Laveleye, Kutter and Ragaz as key Christian socialists who influenced Rauschenbusch. All these men were powerful figures. Their convictions flamed with power and passion. Their writings were polemical and evangelistic. Their lives, in the main, were dramatic. Kingsley and Maurice used the context of theological orthodoxy. Laveleye seemed to be a crypto-sectarian in the Roman church. Kutter and Ragaz were Calvinists who retained the transformationist catholicity of Reformed theology while embracing liberal theology and socialism. Yet, the Zurich socialists had a certain vertebrate quality to their convictions not characteristic of later liberals.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 244-249. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

[3] Ragaz, *ibid.*, Chapter XXI. [4] Ragaz, *ibid.*, Chapter IV.

[5] Ragaz expressed great love for the Quakers. One of the leading German Quakers, Emil Fuchs, reciprocated in his book, *Leonhard Ragaz, Prophet Unserer Zeit* (Oberursel/Ts: Kompass-Verlag, n. d.).

As pointed out in the beginning of this chapter these transformationists did not reach him in the earliest stages of his development either theologically or ethically. But the prophetic attack on materialistic capitalism, the identification of socialist movements with the Kingdom of God and the sharp critique of conservative churches blessing capitalism are highly probable contributions of these men.

One way of expressing the transformationist relation to the other motifs is to say that pietism and sectarianism provided the moulds and forms into which liberalism poured the content under the motivation of transformationism. While there is truth to the foregoing affirmation, there is an interaction among the motifs whereby content is provided from all three of the motifs. For example, the transformationists provide the socialist emphasis in a theological context. Sectarianism persists in terms of discipleship and ecclesiology. These issues will be dealt with at great length in our summary.

As is usually the case, tensions remain in the formulations provided by transformationism. There is the tension between the prophet calling for a triumphant social faith and the realistic knowledge of how the faith is often strangled by tradition. There is the tension between concrete social movements calling for identification and the life of the church history scholar removed from Hell's Kitchen. There is the very grave tension for all Christian transformationists and their secular transformationist colleagues. There is the tension between the Kingdom as coterminous with socialism and the Kingdom as more than any human value. There is the tension between Rauschenbusch's transformationist hopes and the tragic denouement of his life during the fanatical anti-German hysteria of World War I where some of his comrades in social action abandoned him.

Despite all these tensions, some of his ethics were given structure by the transformationists, and some of his ethics originated in the thought of the transformationists.

CHAPTER VI

THE CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

Our study has revealed the nature of Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God ethics in terms of his unique appropriation and selection of materials from the four basic motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. The grand theme of the Kingdom of God runs through the structure of his ethics. This is constructed from the materials found in the four *motifs*. This basic argument of the study is made probable by evidence offered from Rauschenbusch's family background in which pietism, sectarianism and liberalism were operating; by evidence from the *Zeitgeist* in which pietism and liberalism were operating; by evidence from Rauschenbusch's understanding of himself, first, as a pietist and then as a sectarian and a liberal; and the evidence from numerous influential writers and their books as they operated in the life of a well-read man with an excellent education.

In the development of Rauschenbusch's ethics we have seen that he both reflected his conditioning in terms of the four basic motifs utilized in the Kingdom of God ethics and also displayed originality and creativity in the use of the materials given in his experience and background. Hence, this study has not been one dealing with a brittle determinism or a capricious originality. It is a study of how Rauschenbusch exercised his freedom in a very specific historical context.

The proof which has been offered, by definition, was not absolute in character. Quite the contrary, the assumption was that this study must only make probable, possible and permissible this conclusion.

Let us consider each of the four themes with respect to the evidence involved in our quest for proof concerning their relationship to the total development of his ethics.

Pietism does not contribute positively to the Kingdom of God master theme since it came to Rauschenbusch in a subjective, inner and individualistic form. Indeed, it was precisely the breakdown of this individualistic subjectivism which moved him toward the more corporate Kingdom of God master theme. Permanent perspectives remained from pietism. These will be reviewed in subsequent pages of this concluding chapter.

The probability of pietism being a factor in the development of his ethics is rather high in view of the background of the two Rauschenbusch's in Lutheran and Baptist pietism, and in view of the nineteenth century theological Zeitgeist in which pietism was a powerful movement, and in Rauschenbusch's early piety which had all the marks of a conversionist pietism.

A further remarkable fact is the relation of pietism to sectarianism and liberalism. The affinity here contributes much to our general quest for the interaction among the motifs in relation to the master theme of the Kingdom of God.

The study of sectarianism reveals the powerful Kingdom of God materials available to Walter Rauschenbusch. The high probability of this as an influence is seen in his father's early encounter with left-wing research on the Continent. This early encounter related his father to basic historical materials from Professor C. W. Cornelius of Munich which Walter Rauschenbusch utilized throughout his career. Hence, both in terms of family and in terms of books there is important evidence in the direction of sectarianism. The _Zeitgeist_ contributed very little to the sectarianism dimension of his development. On the other hand, his own understanding of himself as a prophet of left-wing

Protestantism is a very real strand of evidence shedding light on how he appropriated, selected and sifted materials for his Kingdom of God ethics. This is particularly true since he lumped left-wing Protestantism together with social movements which were culturally but not theologically liberal. The reference here is to socialism, labor movements and so on. What is more important, this evidence is offered to underscore one of the most frequently ignored sources for the origins of his social ethics. Thus, here is a free appropriation of sectarian motifs in relation to the other three motifs as basic to the understanding of his Kingdom of God ethics.

The study of liberalism also reveals the solid Kingdom of God materials which he obtained from liberal sources. Unlike sectarianism which he did not share with all Social Gospellers, liberalism is shared with all the American Social Gospel thinkers and many of the European thinkers.

The family background presents evidence of an early relationship with liberal movements in Germany to be followed by a constant interaction of liberal experiences even in the pietist setting of his early life. The _Zeitgeist_ is very important with liberal emphases at work at every level of culture and theology. His own self-image is very consciously liberal. Many writers and books figure in his growth and development as a liberal.

From all this evidence it seems clear that liberal influence is very real and that it is at work in relation to sectarian and liberal influences. This is presented, incidentally, as a two-layer kind of liberalism, namely, both cultural and theological.

The transformationists also contribute a solid body of Kingdom of God materials. By way of evidence they are not found in the family background. The _Zeitgeist_ is not too important unless one makes allowance for a certain transformationist aspect of American evangelicalism. In self-understanding Rauschenbusch identifies himself with the Christian socialists in England and

Switzerland he read the books of these Christian socialists with great relish. These books did not arrive on the scenes of his thinking as early as Henry George's and Bellamy's books. Yet they very likely amplified and enriched his thinking by way of a suggestive theological context for a radical Christian social ethics.

This is a brief, synoptic view of evidence for his development of the Kingdom of God social ethics through the four motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. In every case, an effort has been made to search for the explicit relationship of Rauschenbusch to the proposed sources of influence in his thinking. It is impossible to offer absolute proof in these matters. But a great amount of evidence has been offered which makes the argument of this study quite probable. For example, the approach in this study seems more probable than the environmentalist argument that the Social Gospel was simply the way middle class Protestants responded to the new industrialism and urban capitalism. In this theory no attempt is made to explain the *particular* response found in the Social Gospel. On the other hand, the argument of this dissertation makes much clearer why Rauschenbusch responded in this particular way.

Therefore, the present writer concludes that Rauschenbusch's social ethics are understood by studying origins through his unique selection and appropriation of materials from pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism.

Rauschenbusch's final synthesis (along with other social thinkers) has been praised by John A. Hutchison in the recent *Festschrift* for Reinhold Niebuhr. Professor Hutchison observed:

> It is the enduring achievement of the Social Gospel to have recaptured the social nature of the Christian faith and to have expressed it in new and challenging terms. In such a climate of opinion (individualism and other-worldliness) the Social Gospel reasserted and reclaimed the social nature of the Christian religion. This must be regarded as an important religious as well as social achievement. Socially it had the force of

> challenging if not breaking the close alliance between Protestantism and the American business class.
>
> In these respects--and they are important ones--the Frontier Fellowship continued the Social Gospel tradition.[1]

Coming from one of the closest followers of Reinhold Niebuhr, this statement is remarkable in suggesting the permanent aspects of the work of Rauschenbusch as a leading exponent of the Social Gospel movement. On the other hand, the Rauschenbusch synthesis was quite vulnerable to attack. This suggests the need for evaluation.

First, consider the general historical perspective with which Rauschenbusch approached the problem. He was a church historian with a rich European background. While he acknowledged the resources of the Old Testament, the Apostolic Church, the Reformation, the Enlightenment and the Puritans he had a tendency to underestimate the validity of all earlier formulations of social concern and, hence, to fling himself too uncritically upon the resources operating dynamically in his time, particularly through the Enlightenment. His understanding of periodization made him feel that this was an opportunity without parallel in the history of the church. While the *form* and dynamic *power* of sectarianism and pietism remained with him, he was always tempted to pour in the content of current idealism. It was this *content* which was particularly vulnerable to attack. He could have drawn more deeply on the tragic sense of history which many sectarians possessed. He could have drawn on Maurice's sense of God's great redemptive events as over against sanctified temporal effort. He could have taken Weiss more seriously than Wellhausen. He could have been more critical of the theological foundations of Mazzini. However, we cannot expect him to have all the insights now available to us. But these other options were there.

---

[1] John A. Hutchison, ed., *Christian Faith and Social Action* (New York: Charles Scribners, 1953), pp. 8-9.

To be sure, it was a time of great social excitement, a pleroma of ethical power which tended to sweep everything in front of it. Everywhere new life was bursting forth. A glib explanation has been offered in some quarters that this was due to emancipation from stultifying orthodoxies, theological and ethical. An almost incredible united front of forces existed in both the formative and mature years of Rauschenbusch. In theological, Biblical, historical, social and political thought the new liberalism surged forward with much inner confidence and outer impact. It appeared that to dissent from part of the new idealism was to dissent from all of it. This, of course, was not true. The Anglicans have proved this by synthesizing cultural liberalism and Catholic orthodoxy. But this was less clear in the States where idealism conquered almost everything in main-line Protestantism in an astonishingly short period of time. Not only important elements of sectarianism and pietism suffered serious losses but other types also started to speak with a Kantian-Ritschlian accent. The tactical situation was, therefore, quite difficult for Rauschenbusch, particularly when its interpretation was wrenched from a clear relationship to past traditions.

All this led to a complex formulation of the Social Gospel. This study has documented the multiple origin of the normative and classic presentation by Walter Rauschenbusch. There was far less awareness of particular confessional backgrounds than in today's discussions in the ecumenical movement where the starting points are confessional and historical and then ecumenical.[1] At the very least, we are under the obligation to find out what was selected, what rejected, and on what principle these multiple backgrounds were dealt with. And above all, we must seek to find if one of these backgrounds was really regulative of the others.

---

[1] The writer underwent this experience in preparation for the 1957 North American Conference on Faith and Order. Each confessional representative was first asked to state what is crucial in his view of the church.

Not only was Rauschenbusch's formulation complex, it was unique. As Visser t' Hooft has pointed out, Rauschenbusch was wrong in dating social concern so recently as the nineteenth century but he was right in assuming that his particular formulation was unique.[1] The bypassing of natural law for an emphasis on taking Jesus seriously in a discipleship of love plus an integration of this with transformationist themes in an idealistic--scientific setting--all this is unprecedented in any previous time in the church. It is precisely this exact mixture which require scrutiny and testing.

In addition, the Rauschenbusch presentation was systematically unified around the Kingdom of God motif yet there were contradictory elements in his outlook. This synthesis was made against the background of the radical questioning of all traditions and the climate of freedom and experimentation. For example, Rauschenbusch combined the pietist prejudice against theology, with the contradictory aim to reconstruct theology by creating a theology for the social gospel; again, he emphasized love as preeminent, yet he made love compatible with self-interest; he stressed the importance of taking Jesus seriously and literally along with the importance of institutional analysis and power relationships. It is necessary to discover where these conflicts and tensions are and then profit from them in a sounder statement of social policy for our time.

The opening quotation above from the Niebuhr Festschrift suggests that there is something enduring about the Rauschenbusch formulation. Subsequent paragraphs have stressed some aspects of his work which tend to create problems in locating the permanent dimensions of his labors. To look at the situation more carefully, let us consider four major influences in his outlook to discover their mutual relations, possibilities and limitations.

The Influence of Pietism

Two generations of pietistic conditioning followed by freedom in the context of idealism led Rauschenbusch to theological changes. The chapter on pietism stressed its affinity with the Enlightenment as symbolized by Immanuel Kant. Modern Anabaptist scholars, notably Friedmann have underscored the affinity of Anabaptism with pietism and the subsequent subjectivizing of discipleship. Mead and Nichols at The University of Chicago have seriously attacked pietism for its evil effects on American Protestantism. This body of evidence suggests both the dynamic power as well as the corroding effect of pietism. And so it was in the case of Rauschenbusch.

---

[1] Visser t' Hooft, op. cit., p. 51.

Rauschenbusch's pietism broke down in New York City because it was too individualistic and other-worldly. He rejected this individualism and other-worldiness as well as the subjectivism, the orthodox theology and the conversionist psychology.

Yet the legacy of pietism in Rauschenbusch created a series of crucial perspectives and formal attitudes which never left him. The suspicion of confessional dogmatism persisted. In many ways the Anabaptist, the transformationists and the liberals in rejecting confirmed dogmatism would agree. But Rauschenbusch himself saw the need to spell out intelligently theological convictions even when rejecting confessional dogmatism. A protest against the abuse of theology easily moves to a rejecting of all theology, thence to a vacuum into which will rush all sorts of dubious theology.

The pietist critique of the ecclesiastical status quo also gave Rauschenbusch a perspective which he never lost. This merged with the sectarian prophetism, the transformationist attack on the apostasy of the church and the liberal critique of ecclesiastical forms of thought and life. Unlike Norman Thomas who left the church because of his critique of its compromise, Rauschenbusch never lost affection for the church nor ceased formal relations with it. As pastor, seminary teacher, Baptist official, Federal Council advocate, member of a local congregation and widely used speaker and writer in many communions, Rauschenbusch always criticized the church from the inside perspective. But his writings never failed to convey the belief that the church was bordering on apostasy most of the time. This he said not in the spirit of Voltaire or Mencken but more in the mood of Wesley or of Grebel.

If Rauschenbusch's pietism gave him tension with theology and ecclesiasticism, it also gave him a perspective of tension with conventional social practices. Pietism makes peace with the larger structural arrangements of society (a peace Rauschenbusch emphatically rejected!) but creates tension with dissipated living. Hence, it is not surprising that Rauschenbusch's six-point critique of Socialism included the following: "The sanctity of the family and the radical Christian attitude on the question of intoxicants."[1] The corruption of this attitude is the legalistic emphasis on adiaphra whereby one strains for the gnat and swallows the camel. But this rejection of the so-called worldly pleasures persisted in Rauschenbusch even though he did not break fellowship with those who disagreed. At the same time, he retained a real delight in the sounds, sights, colors and harmonies of nature which protected him from a humorless asceticism.

A final pietist factor which actually contributed to his social awakening is the concern and compassion for people. In part this is expressed in pastoral outreach and, in part, through welfare institutions for the orphan, the aged and the ill. Bringing this personalism into New York on a more individualistic base created unbearable tension. Fortunately this personalism demanded a more complex social answer which pietism, as such, could not contribute. But his sensitivity to human suffering moved out into a larger expression.

These pietist perspectives, then, certainly prepared Rauschenbusch for his pilgrimage of social concern. Because pietism is un-theological, because it is un-socialized, its moral and spiritual earnestness usually project the more sensitive pietists into a quest for a sociology and a theology. The danger is that the anti-theological prejudice may lead to a quest for a secular sociology and ethics.

---

[1] Mathews and Smith, op. cit., pp. 90-91.

If Anabaptism and Puritanism are in danger of succumbing to pietism, pietism is in danger of leading to liberal idealism in theological and sociological content. The complex of pietist perspectives tended to move Walter Rauschenbusch toward liberalism. On the positive side, the pietist quest for holiness blocked the path to moral relativism.

Chronologically pietism is crucial in Rauschenbusch's development be-it developed attitudes leading to changes of thought; and it provided moral earnestness and a concern for human suffering and spiritual agony. As a *permanent perspective* pietism provided forms into which the content of other views were poured. Therefore, pietism is a basic part of the social gospel as formulated by Rauschenbusch.

The Influence of Sectarianism

Rauschenbusch's encounter with the left-wing was typical of his approach to other movements. He approached this stream of Christian influence with the utmost freedom in accepting and rejecting the major insights. He did not have a compact typology suggesting the various kinds of Reformation sectarians. He tended to lump them all together while, in fact, borrowing his mood and his sociology from the aggressive sects and his emphasis on love more from the withdrawing type. He viewed the Continental Anabaptists as the charismatic enthusiasm of the poor people for the simplicities of Jesus. This lead to a radical criticism of church and state. This, in turn belonged to a periodized continuum with other creative movements of which today's social upheavel and social gospel are a part. Finally, he did not distinguish clearly between the Anabaptists and the Puritans even though he was right in finding prophetic resources in both which saved his Enlightenment idealism from dissolving his religious foundations.

Consider what he rejected and accepted from the sectarian groups. In so doing we must carefully sift the evidence to see if, in fact, he utilized these materials or, on the other hand, imposed an interpretation on them which they will not bear.

Among the things which he rejected from the Continentals was any sense of withdrawal, himself emphasizing the transformationist aspects of the aggressive groups. In this connection we should observe that Professor H. S. Bender and other Anabaptist scholars have shown that the principle of the nonaggressive sects was not withdrawal but discipleship leading to a dialectic of entrance into the culture and withdrawal when betrayal of Christ was demanded.

Rauschenbusch also rejected the redemptive eschatological emphasis in the Anabaptists in favor of the immanent teleology of the Kingdom. This is not to say that the Anabaptists did not place a major emphasis on the corporateness of the church and the Kingdom, but rather that the Anabaptists except for the splinter groups on the left accepted the redemptive mission of Christ as primary. Setting aside the primacy of the redemptive work of Christ opened the gates to Enlightenment theology and thought structures generally with less defense against incompatible convictions.

Rauschenbusch's philosophy of history reveals a mixed relationship to the sectarians: he rejected their tragic sense of history and he accepted their sense of periodization. Perhaps this rejection of the apocalyptic aspects of the New Testament was his most costly error since it led to one of his most generally criticized affirmations, namely, his optimistic reading of the Christianization of the family, the church and the state, leaving the economic order as the last bastion of paganism. He viewed the apocalyptic as the spilling of lurid theological colors on the mind of Jesus by the early chruch, a coloration that was not really in the mind of Jesus.

Rauschenbusch did not have a shallow optimism nor did he believe that progress was inevitable: "History laughs," he wrote, "at the optimistic illusion that nothing can stand in the way of progress."[1] There was in him a curious compound of ruthless realism and evolutionary, gradualistic optimism. His ironic spirit led him to attempt to understand the apocalyptic passages of the Bible as wet with tears which are deeply touching even though time-conditioned.

In contrast to the Anabaptists, the Rochester prophet also rejected the Fall and developed a concept of original sin operating as cumulative sin rolling down the biological and social highways of history. Hence, our predicament is serious, indeed even ominous. Yet nothing is endemic to human nature or to history. With the purgative powers of science, we can slough off asceticism, monasticism, sacramentarianism and clericalism.

The evolutionary, optimistic, gradualism of Rauschenbusch is thus a far cry from the essentially Biblical escathology of the Anabaptists and the Puritans.

On the other hand, his feeling for periodization is there, particularly as seen in the early church, the Anabaptists, the Puritans and the Renaissance-Enlightenment. This concept of periodization gave him a profound historical perspective despite his tendency to set aside the tragic sense of history. He delights in the early church's impact on Judaism in relation to racism and legalism; its tearing down of existing barriers with irresistible force and its positive promoting of fraternalism, democracy and communism. Likewise, the Anabaptist doctrine in its day moved with a swift rush, brimful of social implications. Likewise the Puritans originated in a revolutionary situation which they helped to create and to extend. Always there is a picture of history as a dramatic development where real issues and great events shake the very foundations of conventional life. He presents a picture of now greater now lesser intensity. If it is a period of great intensity then the prophetic office must be used to delineate the crucial character of the period. Rauschenbusch's approach to great historical events makes history pulsate with rich meaning.

---

[1] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 215.

In terms of a more complex typology of Anabaptist parties, Rauschenbusch appears to be rooted in the radical Anabaptists of the Hoffman and Joris type who see a third age dawning in history itself. However, the soundly Biblical Anabaptists would not quite recognize themselves in the peculiar synthesis of Rauschenbusch even though his periodized historical outlook would be a point of contact. In this over-all view probably the liberal dimension is regulative. On the other hand, it was into the forms of left-wing periodization minus a tragic sense of history that he poured the content of his conviction that the twentieth century is a truly creative point in time. Thus the unique approach of Rauschenbusch continues to be the way in which he relates and integrates the various tributaries of influence. Previous Rauschenbusch research has underestimated this sectarian influence in the final integration which he developed. No doubt, this influence helped to block the path to a purely cultural Christianity. Yet the liberal climax and content of his thought at this point are decisive.

If Rauschenbusch rejected the withdrawal tendencies and the tragic sense of history, he also accepted certain positive insights of the sectarians.

First of all, Rauschenbusch stresses the imitation of Christ. At the age of seventeen, the necessity of discipleship came to him in a poignant religious experience. Because of it he thought he "ought to follow Jesus Christ in his personal life and die over again his death."[1] He rejected the inner Christ mysticism of President Strong of Rochester but insisted that his own emphasis on discipleship was a definitely Christocentric position. Whether in Hell's Kitchen or watching in the Passion Play at Oberammergau he was moved by the basic belief that Jesus was to be stripped of all dogmatic and historical accretions and then taken literally and seriously.

---

[1] Sharpe, op. cit., p. 57.

Some of his critics understood this emphasis only too well. Already we have quoted James Dombrowski who objected strenously to this return to a pure Jesus recovered by modern research as the key to moral and ethical effectiveness.[1] Rauschenbusch was saying, according to Dombrowski, that the trouble is that we have the wrong ethical ideal, namely, the supernatural Jesus. For Dombrowski the real problem is the basic character of our society, a character with which discipleship is incapable to deal.

Visser t' Hooft also perceived this fragmentary literalism in Rauschenbusch and found it wanting.[2] He charges that this method takes a number of principles from the teachings of Jesus and then confronts the social order with each of them in turn without making any clearly systematized analysis of society as a whole.

On the other hand, this emphasis on following Jesus in discipleship as a fundamental ethical conception is a long-standing affirmation in sectarian groups.

A second sectarian theme, is the primacy of love in personal _and_ social ethics. Not only is love coming from God--a familiar Christian emphasis--but love is also supremely seen in the life and the death of Christ. Christ's death underscored all he had said on love with his life. Another sectarian emphasis is that we cannot love God without loving the brother. Love makes society. Love relates us to society in its suffering. Love is the crowning grace of the Kingdom. In addition to joining the sectarians on these aspects of love, Rauschenbusch is similar to the sectarians is having no doctrine of natural law, no middle principles, no adequate delineation of the relation of love to justice. It is a forthright attempt to construct an essentially love ethic for all of society. The traditional Puritan themes of the soveriegnty of God, the covenant, the high political and social implications of the Old Testament are missing.

---

[1] Dombrowski, _op. cit._, pp. 24-25.

[2] Visser t' Hooft, _op. cit._, p. 51.

Third, Rauschenbusch joins the sectarians quite readily in locating the Kingdom in history rather than in an other-worldly subjectivism. While the sectarians of the sixteenth century had a definite eschatology in addition to the this-worldly focus, Rauschenbusch moves from the theocratic prophetism of the Old Testament to the Kingdom of God on earth. This provided a concrete, societal, historical experience.

Fourth, he accepts much of the ecclesiology of the sectarians in which the true church is a disciplined, democratic, voluntary brotherhood. But, Rauschenbusch goes beyond the Anabaptists by analogy the true church stimulates similar institutions in secular society just as hierarchical sacerdotalism encourages anti-democratic social forms. The church can easily become apostate when it loses touch with the Kingdom. When it serves the Kingdom it is truly within God's purposes. Nevertheless, the church can never fully contain the power of the Kingdom which surges into history partly in, partly out of the church. When out of the church it is operating in righteous social movements seeking the improvement of life.

The imitation of Christ, the primacy of love for personal and social relationships, an immanent this-worldliness and an analagous ecclesiology, constitute the corpus of sectarian affirmations and negations. From these affirmations Rauschenbusch develops his own thought in relation to other motifs.

In order to be quite clear, let us stress here that very little remains in the original formulations of the sectarians. These are the forms of sectarianism but not all of the content--although there is some of the content. It is precisely the manner in which he takes sectarianism at certain points and mixes it with liberal and transformationist conceptions which makes Rauschenbusch a unique figure in the history of Christian social thought. For example, Jesus is to be followed and imitated. But it is the Jesus delivered from false accretions by scientific research. (Never mind Weiss and Schweitzer!!) Love is Alpha and Omega in everything from families to nations. But love must be socialized so that it goes beyond a cup of cold water to a hugh new waterworks in the hills. The scope of the Kingdom is within history: it is here now bursting old wineskins. But the Kingdom is almost immanent in history. Or again, the church is a voluntary brotherhood yet much of the Kingdom operates outside of the church, even among unbelievers. Therefore, when allowance is made for his always free use of all his materials, nevertheless distinct sectarian themes remain which current neo-orthodox thought would be quick to recognize in view of its rejection of these themes.

Having shown what he borrowed, what he rejected and what he transformed from the sectarians, ti will be well to point to certain unresolved tensions which remained in his thought.

The sectarian background blocked a purely Christ-of-culture type of Christianity, and a permanent tension remained at this point.

The emphasis on taking Jesus both seriously and literally remained in tension with the institutional analysis derived from the Enlightenment and from subsequent idealist social skills.

Love as realism and love as contradiction remained in some tension.

Pessimism concerning the empirical churches, and optimism about the role of a creative, radical religious minority remained in tension.

Periodization remains in tension with progress.

The creative effect of the church on society remains in tension with the church as dull, conservative and socially conditioned.

The church as the channel of the Kingdom and a sense of the Kingdom as supra-institutional also remain in tension.

The emphasis on discipleship and the rejection of literalism remain in tension.

An ecumenical spirit remains in tension with an unconscious sectarianism making it difficult for "Catholics" of any party to follow his line of thought.

The Influence of Liberalism

Already we have shown that the pietistic and sectarian influences are quite real. Particularly did these two provide much of the form and mould for some of the content which allegedly came from idealism. Yet a living relationship among all these various factors remains.

Earlier, eleven scholars have been cited who believed that Walter Rauschenbusch was to be seen primarily as a liberal despite equally vigorous voices viewing him as sectarian, pietist or transformationist. To check the argument of those who do see him as liberal requires our sifting the impact of a movement whose wheat and chaff fell over many aspects of thought and life. The long chapter on the Enlightenment dealt with liberal theologians, Biblical scholars, historians, socio-economic thinkers and concrete experiences mediating the outlook of idealism. Therefore, one must cover considerable territory in assessing the impact of idealism. It will simplify matters to divide the Enlightenment liberals into two main groups: the theologians and the socio-economic thinkers.

From the liberal theologians, historians, and Biblical scholars there are ten emphases which are found to Walter Rauschenbusch:

1. Attack on the Hellenization of theology
2. Attack on irrational elements in religion

3. Emphasis upon experience
4. Rejection of confessional dogmatism
5. Anti-metaphysical outlook
6. Stress upon the historical Jesus
7. Making redemption secondary to the teleology of Kingdom
8. Solidarity in sin and salvation
9. Rejection of forensic atonement
10. Gradualism and Pelagian optimism

Remembering that Rauschenbusch always presides over his mentors, it is still in order to say that the above ten factors were operative in his outlook. Needless to say, they are formidable. But to see the independence of Rauschenbusch it may be well to review his encounter with Ritschl in whom idealism comes to focus most intensely among the thinkers in theological, historical, Biblical group.

1. He agreed with Ritschl's definition of the Kingdom as a universal moral fellowship motivated by love. More than Ritschl, however, he stressed the Kingdom as the Reign of God.

2. The role of the Kingdom is of prime importance to both Ritschl and Rauschenbusch.

3. The response to Jesus is discipleship in Rauschenbusch. Here Ritschl disagreed since his rigid historicism could not allow direct contact with Jesus in the present. For Rauschenbusch the response to Jesus is both personal in discipleship and social through the church and social movements. For Ritschl the response is only social. The latter is spelled out in terms of the community of believers. When the community of believers is engaged in public worship it is the church; when it is engaged in moral action it is the Kingdom of God.[1]

---

[1] See pp. 223-224, in the present study.

4. The function of the Kingdom for Rauschenbusch is to Christianize the social order by the abolition of unjust privilege while changing semi-Christian social institutions. The function of the Kingdom in Ritschl is to help nations to self-realization as Christ brings to fruition the cultural destiny of certain peoples: the rich historical-communalism of the culture meets the historical-communalism of the Christian faith. This, rather than Christianization, is the Ritschlian proposal, a view less prophetic and much more deterministic.

5. For Rauschenbusch the scope of the Kingdom is history struggling against subjectivism, other-worldliness and apocalypticism. In the main Ritschl agreed with this non-eschatological historical now-ness.

6. In ethics there is no essential difference in theory although there was considerable difference in practice since Rauschenbusch was an American activist. Both stress love as the ethic of the Kingdom and the correlate of the Kingdom. Rauschenbusch explicitly made love the ethical foundation of all relationships personal and social. Ritschl did not propose to build all social institutions on love.

7. The sociology of the Kingdom in Rauschenbusch's thought, is based on solidaristic, socio-organi context in which sin expresses itself in super-personal social institutions bound together in the Kingdom of evil. This evil Kingdom is to be countered with the Kingdom of God which deals with specific social groups and specific social problems. Ritschl, again, had the same theoretical position but lagged far behind Rauschenbusch in structured institutional analysis and economic emphasis.

8. The ecclesiology is highly different in the two men. Rauschenbusch sees the church as a disciplined, democratic voluntary association which directly affects social institutions. Ritschl makes the church a purely devotional community. Only the Kingdom is given a moral definition and here the Kingdom is identified with the invisible church. The church is thus stripped of cru-

cial functions, giving ethics an independent status apart from the church, and giving the church a secondary role.

9. In philosophy of history both are gradualistic except that Rauschenbusch had a sectarian periodization not fully present in Ritschl.

The differences and the agreements are quite real. There are different views of discipleship, the social role of love, the role of Christianization, the institutional analysis in solidaristic sociology, ecclesiology and part of the philosophy of history. Actually, only the primary role of the Kingdom can be listed without qualification among the agreements. Thus, while affinity is here and while Ritschl is basic to Rauschenbusch, it is equally clear that Rauschenbusch shows his independence as always. And, most significantly, Rauschenbusch reveals his sectarian background in his peculiar emphasis on discipleship, love and the doctrine of the church. Moreover, his view of Christianization is much closer to the Puritan reading of that problem than Ritschl's organismic outlook of national self-realization.

Turning to the socio-economic thinkers, the influence is also quite real. The right hand of Ritschl and Harnack did not necessarily know what the left hand of George and Bellamy was doing. Ritschl died in 1889 without extending his liberal theology into liberal ethics. Moreover, the two parties were not always together in ability or in scholarly tools. Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl were original systematic thinkers. Men like George and Bellamy were popularizers and muckrackers. Nevertheless, the work of George and Bellamy--like them--was very influential, mediating Enlightenment insights to thousands.

Their contributions to Rauschenbusch were six:

1. A theology of social institutions
2. The economic interpretation of ethics in terms of the cardinal sin of Mammonism
3. The religious and social value of socialism

4. The doctrine of progress
5. A false historical perspective stressing the recency of social concern
6. An eclectic spirit

The theology of social institutions is the greatest and perhaps soundest contribution of the Enlightenment to Rauschenbusch. In this sense the Enlightenment is a watershed of history where a new factor is introduced which was not previously there save by implication. Rational analysis of social institutions is the development which makes the Enlightenment a watershed rather than the Middle Ages and the Reformation. Neither the Bible, nor the Reformers, nor Thomas Aquines had this element. This is not to say that the Bible, Thomism and the Reformation were or are incompatible with rational analysis of social institutions. Indeed, the Bible and the Reformation are very important resources, providing a priceless perspective and deep insights. It is only to say that these latter materials developed prior to modern social science.

At this point the sectarian background enters the perspective of Rauschenbusch suggesting a radical criticism of the existing order and a periodized sense of doom over outmoded social institutions. He had the Enlightenment sense of a "natural" order contrasted with the existing one as in Laveleye. He mixed sectarian radicalism with studies of the misery and decline of the working classes as in Heath. He mixed a radical critique of capitalism with almost naive rational hopes of a totally new social order as in George and Bellamy. As Visser t' Hooft discerned it was the universalization and rationalization of sectarian ethics. Part of the universalization was from the transformationist streams of Calvinism and Catholicism and part from the buoyant rational optimism of the Enlightenment focusing on rational explanation of causality. Rauschenbusch did not study Aristotle, Hobbes (1588-1679), Montesquieu (1689-1755), Hegel (1770-1831), Darwin (1809-1882), Marx (1818-1883) or any other social philosophers. The specifics of his social ethics came from powerful but popular thinkers like George and Bellamy. In any case, the universalization of his ethics took place.

The mention of Marx also poses the question of the origins of the very strong economic interpretation of ethics in Rauschenbusch and other social gospel figures. Strangely enough, Marx nowhere appears in the Rauschenbusch's development of this point. Rauschenbusch has a real affinity for all kinds of liberal and radical thinkers who make Mammonism a major factor, if not _the_ major factor in the shaping of belief and influence. Seldom does he stray from thinkers with some semblance of religious perspective. The bitter iconoclasm of Marx was too much for Rauschenbusch. Rauschenbusch felt at home with Mazzini and Maurice. Today the tides have changed with the Niebuhrian criticism now emphasizing the role of power primarily in political terms. Politics is the arena, par excellence, for the study of man's predicament. To Rauschenbusch politics was a facade--and a pretty tawdry one!--for economics.

Here again many factors converged: the pietist skepticism of idleness and luxury, the sectarian stress on the perverted alliance between Christianity and worldly institutions, the idealistic delineation of economic causation of human motivation and intrigue and the very common synthesis of utopian economics and religious idealism.

Socialism was also a key idea of the Rauschenbusch outlook. Never was his socialism as clear-cut as Bliss's and Ward's nor his general emphasis upon it as radical as Herron's and Sprague. But it was there and it was important. More immediately, it was mediated by George and Bellamy. Surely, New York has been the center of socialist thought in America. It has been the political center in the U. S. A. On the Continent and Great Britain the impact of Karl Marx and various Marxist and neo-Marxist parties was great, leaving its impact on Christian thought. Having drunk deeply from the cup of European life and thought, his mind was well prepared for socialism as, for example, his early encounter with Professor Todt who argued for the compatibility of the New Testament with socialism.

Even his pietism was introduced into his critique of socialism since he objected to the liberal attitude toward liquor and family life in socialist movements. To the end he was a Puritan in Babylon as far as the earthy rough and tumble personal ethics of socialist movements was concerned.

His sectarianism suggested radical and far-reaching social changes and a particular perspective for challenging the status quo. In sectarianism there is a layer of utopianism which is collectivism and communalism. While Rauschenbusch was not attracted by utopian communities, he was open to radical social change, the content for which was provided by lost children of the church shaped by the Enlightenment.

The doctrine of progress was the fourth contribution of the Enlightenment. Rauschenbusch set aside the tragic sense of history of the sectarian in favor of the optimistic spectacles of the idealistic thinkers. If he had stayed with the sixteenth century radicals, he would have been delivered from this fatal miscalculation. Actually Rauschenbusch's realism was constantly fighting his idealistic progressivism. Nevertheless, he was committed to progress . It was a rather united as well as a rather persistent voice. It came through the Biblical field where the new Weiss-Schweitzer view could have been accepted but only at the cost of upsetting a fairly well integrated view of progress. It would have demanded a re-tooling which most key thinkers were not prepared to make. Indeed, Reinhold Niebuhr was to make this challenge for most Protestants roughly twenty years later and for most Protestants thirty and forty years later.

Progress conceptions also came through historians. If orthodoxy could be stripped of irrational elements, the bondage of the past could be stripped off and the pure essence of truth could flow back into history. Harnack's hellenization of theology was Rauschenbusch's stock in trade here.

The idea of progress also came from the economic thinkers who pointed to capitalism and Mammonism as the devils. Destroy these and the whole poisoned atmosphere of the Kingdom of Evil would begin to crumble.

Even sectarian periodization came into the picture, suggesting that this was one of those pregnant moments of history when something staggering and tremendous was about to take place. No the Christ of creeds and sacraments but the Jesus of life was now visible. Let us follow Jesus in the new apostolate. Analyze social conditions fearlessly and rationally. Let us exchange capitalism for socialism. If we do these things history would zoom upward as it has already in family, school and state.

The fifth impact of the Enlightenment was a shortened historical perspective. Modernity looked too good, too neat, too slick and too satisfied with itself. Christian orthodoxy seemed hopelessly cramped and paralytic. The past generally appeared pathetically out moded. As Lincoln Steffens said upon studying the Soviet Union, "The future is here and it works." This same false perspective of the Enlightenment caused Rauschenbusch to date Christian social concern too late in the history of the church. He recognized the gleams of light before the nineteenth century but they were only gleams not a major stream of organized light. The sectarians, Rauschenbusch observed, made the mistake of not winning the working classes who composed their ranks. Today, he said, we must not repeat this error. A working class theology calls for a working class economic and political movement. This tended to shut off creative encounter with the answer of the Middle Ages, the Puritans and the British Anglo-Catholic socialists. He read the latter but did not accept their basic affirmations even though they provided sound criticisms. To be sure, with an escalator view of history, he could not come out much differently.

Finally, the eclectic spirit of the Enlightenment made it difficult to be critical about the whole gamut of idealistic thinkers. The Kantian-

Ritschlian errors in not having an adequate sociology were corrected by later liberal thinkers with mature institutional analysis. The genius of Christian thought is to be critical of all movements including those which appear to bring emancipation and deliverance. It is now clear that precisely the inability of movements to offer internal criticisms, self-criticisms, is their weakness. Neither a stultifying confessionalism nor an emotional Romanticism, nor a Burke-Hamilton conservatism offered an apperthy alternative to live. Not finding a plausible criticism and seeing how almost all learned Christians accepted this new *Zeitgeist* Rauschenbusch was therefore much more open to its impact.

Idealism was a complex, powerful conquering movement with representatives as different as Ritschl and Mazzini. The anti-theological and anti-institutional outlook of pietism, the prophetic radicalism of sectarianism both played into this conquering movement. Freely, eclectically and often unwisely the syncretist mixture resulted. There was a dynamic factor, however, yet to be appropriated, namely, transformationism.

Here again, various unresolved tensions remain.

The Ritschlian Christ of culture remains in tension with the sectarian, pietist and Puritan sense of conflict with the culture.

The doctrine of progress remains in tension with the resiliency of accumulated wrong-doing in the Kingdom of evil.

The rigorous pietist-sectarian remain in tension with the learned, sophisticated, traveled, esthetic naturalist.

The discipleship response to Jesus remain in tension with the necessity of complicated structural analysis of society.

The idealistic utopianism remain in tension with a sense of all the intricate networks of cross-purposes and subtle causal factors ruling out utopianism.

Enlightenment historical perspectives remain in tension with tragic Christian historical perspectives.

A churchly, Christ-centered approach remain in tension with an emphasis on democratic social movements and national self-consciousness.

The corrupting influence of economic factors remain in conflict with a faith in the role of reason to purge the human mind of corrupting elements.

The Influence of Transformationism

Great movements always generate great energy and enthusiasm. The social gospel movement was no exception to this. Our study has indicated that Rauschenbusch drew most heavily from Maurice, Kingsley, Ragaz and Kutter. All possessed the vision of vigorously applying the Christian gospel to man and society. Since Rauschenbusch's nurturing was essentially European this is not surprising.

Here in the States, however, and especially in New York City during his social conversion, it is likely that he encountered what Winthrop Hudson calls evangelicalism. It had appeared in England during the eighteenth century leading to mass organization of voluntary associations and the permeation of society with moral sanctions. In America the impact of this free church culture is epitomized in Abraham Lincoln who was a sort of Quakerized Calvinist. Lincoln's life suggested the power of Christianity detached from an institutional expression, a divorce which Hudson feels was ultimately almost fatal.

This evangelicalism with its activist and political vigor was a corrective to the more subjective pietism which Rauschenbusch was given in his youthful nurture. Pietism's social expression is more in welfare work than in an Abraham Lincoln.

The four transformationists--Maurice, Kingsley, Ragaz and Kutter--must constitute our more explicit influences. They were more deeply involved in the Christian tradition. Few modern writers can equal Ragaz and Kutter for their driving evangelistic appeal to take Jesus seriously and thus to shatter modern materialism. The double-standard of Mammonistic materialism calls for an awakening of transformationist energies. This awakening comes not in a web of words, even nice words. Kutter especially saw the role of concrete historical movements which transcend anything we can _say_ about them. This was an essentially Hebraic sense of the reality of history.

Part of this transformationist outlook played into the anti-intellectualism of pietism and its emphasis on experience. Part of it played into the sectarian sense of Truth which is more real than human ideologies and which is the final defense. Part of it played into the hands of the Enlightenment belief that this is a special time in history when dead orthodoxies of religion and commerce must die.

At this point we must deal frankly with the fact that Bliss, Ely, Herron, Stuckenberg and others before, during, and after Rauschenbusch have somewhat similar conceptions out of a less sectarian and more puritanical background. Does this not suggest that Rauschenbusch really borrowed from them rather than that they borrowed from him as sectarian, pietist, and idealist transformationist?

Common to all these positions is the Enlightenment and the transformationist vision. Some came to this from a sectarian or pietist background; some came to it with a Puritan and evangelical background.

The children of Puritanism and evangelicalism, as Frank Hugh Foster and Joseph Haroutunian have shown exchange much of their Calvinist and Reformed theology for the conceptions of the Enlightenment. Foster is happy about the exchange; Haroutunian records a tragedy. What happened to Congregationalism is symbolic of this change: Ritschl is exchanged for Calvin. The transformationist vision is retained. The institutional analysis of idealism is appended to this synthesis. Discipleship and love, for example, are brought in by Ritschl but they never become as decisive as in Rauschenbusch.

A person nurtured in sectarianism and pietism seldom drops the imitation of Christ and discipleship motifs. Rauschenbusch accepted these quite radically at the age of seventeen before his real encounter with German idealism. From liberalism he does purge sectarianism of unacceptable orthodox and supernatural elements. He dissolves much of the kerygma, including Biblical eschathology, and he dissolves much of the Biblical didache. He adds the transformationist vision which the Puritans always had even though pietism frequently destroyed it. He adds the structural analysis of society from idealism.

This explains how two different streams flowed into the formulation of the social gospel having in common the Enlightenment and transformationism. They differed in the legacy of sectarianism and pietism. They also differed in the extent to which Rauschenbusch as the classic formulator of the social gospel was multi-cultural, working astride of Europe and America.

What did Rauschenbusch introduce which was new to the social gospel apart from men like Bliss and Ely? He introduced the conception of the church as a creatively analagous social institution. He stressed the imitation of Christ motif. He had a great sense of historical periodization.

Apart from these factors it is difficult to know whether his role as classic formulator was due to other causes such as great ability in writing. For example, his books are much more moving and readable than those of Professor Peabody of Harvard. These books emerge from an excellent scholarly preparation on two continents plus a great pastoral experience in the greatest American city of social ferment and social thought.

In any case, he made the formulation and it has proved to be both vulnerable to criticism and an unforgettable chapter in the living life of the Church of Christ.

Tensions also remain in the transformationist aspect of his thought.

There is the tension between the triumphant, surging power of the

Christian movement and a knowledge of the devious ways it may, indeed, usually does remain powerless. This is the tension between the realist and the prophet.

There is the tension between the primacy of concrete historical movements and Rauschenbusch's removal from the battles of New York City to the academic citadels of Rochester.

There is the tension between his knowledge that one must join social and political movements and his prophetic and scholarly critique of movements that really seek the transformation of society.

There is the tension between the Christian socialist transformationists and the secular transformationist.

There is the tension between the Kingdom as coterminous with socialism and the understanding of elements in the Kingdom that neither the church nor the Kingdom can contain.

There is the tension between God using the wrath of uncharched unbelievers to praise him and Rauschenbusch's life-long labors as an avowed churchman and Christian.

There is the tension between the transformationist hopes of many of his personal friends and mentors and the collapse of these hopes in defeat and disintegration. (Crapsey, Bellamy, etc.)

A Final Summary and Review

I

What has been accomplished in this study?

First, we have tested previous studies of Rauschenbusch by a historical methodology stressing the significance of origins. An inductive study was made of Rauschenbusch's historical connections intellectually and sociologically conceived. This study of origins is necessary to understand his Kingdom of God ethics in terms of his unique selection and appropriation of materials from four basic motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. This methodology is particularly appropriate for the study of Rauschenbusch since he was a church historian with a complex and rich background in representative movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He himself believed that the study of history was a renovating and reformatory influence in theology.[1] As such the study of history was necessary for ethics. Moreover, Professor Jaroslav Pelikan has pointed out that the study of historical origins is most effective with historical figures who are not system builders but are personalities rooted in their heritages.[2] The system builders, Professor Pelikan suggests, tend to stress logical principles and internal coherence. Rauschenbusch developed a coherent approach to Christian ethics but he was not a system builder in the grand manner.

The study of origins, above all, links this dissertation with the plausible assumption that historical context and historical continuity are necessary for the genuine understanding of any school of thought, ethical or otherwise. In this context Rauschenbusch emerges as a person vitally but not deterministically related to the great movements of his era. He cannot be understood apart from these movements as he formulated the conception of ethics for which he is famous. Yet, his originality and freedom in utilizing his background was so great that he deviated from some of his contemporaries who used these materials in a different way.

In any case, this study of continuity and discontinuity with his background takes place in relation to a man who was unusually generous in leaving evidence of the movements, persons, books and motifs that influenced him. His sound scholarship, wide reading, copious footnoting and historical consciousness make this true. Therefore, the study of origins sheds light on his possible creative use of these four streams of influence in the master theme of the Kingdom of God on earth as an immanent, social, mundane, supra-ecclesiastical movement.

---

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology," American Journal of Theology, XI, 60.

[2] Personal conversation with present writer, April 5, 1957.

This approach is not the only one which could have been used. And, quite frankly, it is not necessarily the ultimate or definitive method. Some of the alternatives to it are the following:

(a) A similar *motif* study could be undertaken with the same basic historical interests but limiting the study to a *single* motif. For example, Winthrop S. Hudson insists that Rauschenbusch must be seen primarily if not exclusively in the context of evangelicalism. Taking Hudson's approach one would study Rauschenbusch solely from a single perspective: in what sense does the evangelical background explain or fail to explain the ethics of Walter Rauschenbusch?

(b) One could also study a figure like Rauschenbusch to discover the most *distinctive element* in his ethics. According to Rauschenbusch himself, the most distinctive element is the Kingdom of God conception. This would be tested. Perhaps the study might conclude that the most distinctive element is his Christology or his eschatology. The assumption is that when this most distinctive element is uncovered and then underscored, the student then can quickly locate the real issue in this person's ethics.

(c) One could make a chronological, *biographical* study such as D. R. Sharpe attempted. While Sharpe had only limited interests in explicit interpretation of Rauschenbusch, any biography is, of necessity, an interpretation through the selection of materials and general emphasis. Many other scholars would be justified in writing biographies of Rauschenbusch either because of new materials which are available or because of a fresh interpretive framework in terms of which the chronological development takes place.

(d) A comparative study could be made whereby one compares and contrasts two or more thinkers in terms of representative theological and ethical conceptions. Owen Weatherly's Master's dissertation illustrates this approach with the self-explanatory title, A Comparative Study of the Social Ethics of Walter Rauschenbusch and Reinhold Niebuhr, (University of Chicago, 1950). Weatherly compares and contrasts the two men on theological conceptions of God, Christ, man, sin, Kingdom of God, teachings of Jesus. He also does a similar study of ethical conceptions of economic, politics and church.

(e) A study can be made which is an expositional and descriptive presentation of Rauschenbusch's ethics as in the doctoral thesis at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1948 by Henlee Hulix Barnett, The Ethical Thought of Walter Rauschenbusch. This study provides a quick review of what the person in question said on a variety of basic topics. There is a brief evaluation at the end of the dissertation.

(f) The final option is a study which utilizes neutral categories or dimensions of ethical problems. For example, one could take Aristotle's four causes and apply these to the specific ethical outlook of Rauschenbusch. This is more in the tradition of philosophical ethics, permitting the reader to see the person studied in a much wider perspective of issues which reveal genuine points of tension and agreement, regardless of historical contexts and backgrounds.

In the face of these various alternatives the present writer chose to make the historical study of multiple motifs because there appeared to be numerous examples of unexamined notions on origins. Most writers made a marginal attempt to link Rauschenbusch with one of the four motifs utilized in this study. The over-simplified, contradictory, unexamined nature of these characterizations called for a much more intense and complete study of his historical backgrounds to complete the context in which later studies can take place. Whether later research deals with the most distinctive feature of his ethics or whether it is analysis of neutral categories the present study will be valuable. The only exception is for those who do not take history seriously.

II

Before indicating some of the results of this study let us re-examine the doctoral dissertation of Vernon Parker Bodein of Yale (1944) to see how our approach of multiple motifs sheds light on his study: The Social Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch and Its Relation to Religious Education.

In his study Bodein affirms this view of Rauschenbusch: "In Rauschenbusch's thought is to be found a middle way between the two extremes of humanism and 'neo-Orthodoxy.' Standing well within the evangelical, (italics mine) tradition of the Protestant faith and never leaving it, Rauschenbusch at the same time presents a sensitivity to social need that should be the possession of those who pray 'Thy Kingdom come.' "[1] In another passage Bodein declares that "his combination of evangelical personal religion with sensitivity to social need comes close to the heart of the Gospel."[2] According to Bodein, then, Rauschenbusch is a mediating evangelical standing between humanism and neo-orthodoxy. Let us now consider how the approach of multiple motifs helps correct this view of Bodein.

First, multiple approach starts with the pietism of the Rauschenbusch family, noting the permanent legacy of emphasis on experience. What is more important, Walter Rauschenbusch pietism broke down during Hell's Kitchen in New York. If pietism is Rauschenbusch's evangelicalism then Rauschenbusch did reject it. He did not totally reject it but he did reject it essentially in terms of ethics, piety and theology.

Second, the roots in sectarianism bar us from seeing Rauschenbusch as a mediator. His prophetic spirit, his zealous mood and his intensity of focus were more sectarian than mediatorial. He seldom sought for the golden mean. Often he was bold, radical and far-reaching in his attitudes.

---

[1] Bodein, op. cit., p. vii. [2] Ibid., p. 157.

Third, the liberal aspect of Rauschenbusch raises serious questions regarding the statement that he never left the evangelical camp. To be sure Rauschenbusch vacillates between a radical embrace of liberalism and his evangelical and pietistic background. But, his understanding of liberalism as a fresh historical epoch caused him to see science and Jesus as interchangeable.

Finally, the transformationist Christian socialists brings a dimension to his thinking which was not previously there. This, too, qualifies the broad generalization that Rauschenbusch is basically an unchanged evangelical who added some social concerns at the top of the structure.

A final value of an historical approach through multiple origins is in the fact that it destroys Bodein's attempt to see Rauschenbusch related to neo-orthodoxy. The latter, of course, did not exist in the formal sense at least, during Rauschenbusch's life. It is an attempt to read something into his labors which is not in the historical context.

Therefore, we conclude that the approach of this study corrects and illuminates the Bodein's Yale dissertation. This is typical of the insight which the present study provided for other previous studies of Rauschenbusch's Social Gospel.

Now let us consider some of the more specific values of this dissertation.

First, in this ecumenical era it is significant to observe how various theological and confessional movements interact with one another. Europe and America engage in unceasing conversation on the great issues of faith and life. This conversation is international and interdenominatal. Perhaps men in more rigorously confessional movements would not reflect the winds of doctrine as much as Rauschenbusch. Yet his roots were really in Lutheranism, the most confessional of all Protestantism. Before he had completed his system he had communicated with the left, center and right of the church. He had been influenced by the whole sweep of church thought and life. And, in addition he was influenced by movements outside of the church. Here is a de facto ecumenicity somewhat before the more formal ecumenical organizations of our time.

Second, in this meeting of motifs and movements the pietistic and sectarian backgrounds mediated by his father have been the most neglected in the understanding of Rauschenbusch. As Visser t' Hooft has suggested Rauschenbusch made a bold attempt to integrate basic sectarian themes with a liberal universality. The peculiar emphases of sectarian on discipleship, the primacy of love, the Kingdom consciousness and the church as a voluntary brotherhood are clearly stamped on the Social Gospel. Yet even if this were no more than a formal influence--and it is more than that--the real point is the synthesizing of materials by Rauschenbusch from pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. All four of these are necessary to find the correct understanding of his Kingdom of God ethics. This rules out a single motif approach. This new pattern of multiple motifs also sheds light on the unusual character of his eclectic formulation. It is not merely the liberal consensus of his day. It is a unique formulation, based on complex origins during a specific historical situation.

Third, this study raises questions over behaviorist and environmentalist explanations of the Social Gospel as suggested by May, Bell and Dombrowski. The reaction of Walter Rauschenbusch to urban-industrial capitalism was a special reaction. He was prepared for this interpretation by a particular kind of theological and cultural influence.

Fourth, the Kingdom of God theme can now be understood in a very particular sense. From many sources he took materials for this conception. It was remarkable how common this theme was utilized in pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. Rauschenbusch, to be sure, did not see the meaning of the term in the total history of Biblical and theological interpretation. In the more gradualist sense of the Kingdom he found an integrating center for his position. While vulnerable to later criticism it was used as a prophetic instrument of judgment on moribund, unjust and even demonic institutions.

Fifth, it is clear that tensions remained at crucial points in the Rauschenbusch formulation. Perhaps the central tension was between the Kingdom of God leading to the Christ-of-culture and the view of the Kingdom as bringing conflict, suffering and crisis. In addition there was the tension between following Jesus in discipleship and the necessity of dealing with the structural, power apparatus of society.

Despite its weaknesses, Rauschenbusch's formulation of social ethics made a genuine contribution to the church. The prophetic critique of the economic order was quite effective. In bringing this critique he helped to break the union between Christianity and bourgeois values. He brought corporate perspectives back to an individualistic Protestantism. Rauschenbusch helped to restore social concern as a permanent aspect of the church's witness.

The present study has opened up some new aspects of the genesis of the Social Gospel. Rauschenbusch's Kingdom of God ethics were presented in terms of his unique selection of materials from the four basic motifs of pietism, sectarianism, liberalism and transformationism. It is assumed that other research will take the understanding of Rauschenbusch's social ethics into new and deeper areas of knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adams, James Luther. "Christian Socialism," in Encyclopedia Brittanica. Chicago: Encyclopedia Brittanica, Inc., n. d.

Barker, Charles Albro. Henry George. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Barnes, Harry Elmer. A History of Historical Writing. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1937.

Barth, Karl. Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert. Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag., 1947.

Bell, Aaron Ignatius. The Urban Impact on American Protestantism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.

Bellamy, Edward. Looking Backward. New York: Modern Library, 1951.

Binyon, Gilbert Clive. The Christian Socialist Movement in England. London: Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1931.

Bliss, W. D. P. Encyclopedia of Social Reform. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1908.

Bodein, Vernon Parker. The Social Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch and its Relation to Religious Education. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.

Cadoux, C. J. The Case for Evangelical Modernism. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1937.

Cavert, S. M. and Van Dusen, H. P. (eds.). The Church Through Half a Century. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Cohen, M. R. and Nagel, E. An Introduction to Logic and the Scientific Method. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1934.

Collingwood, R. G. The Idea of History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Cornelius, C. A. Geschichte des Munsterischen in drei Buchern, II. Leipzig: T. O. Weigle, 1860.

de Laveleye, Emile. Protestantism and Catholicism in Their Bearing Upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations. London: John Murray, 1875.

_______. De La Properte et de ses Formes Primitives. Paris: Felix Alcan, 1901.

Dombrowski, James. The Early Days of Christian Socialism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Egbert, Donald Drew and Persons, Stow (eds.). Socialism and American Life. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Ferm, Vergilius (ed.). An Encyclopedia of Religion. New York: Philosophical Library, 1945.

Friedmann, Robert. Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries. Goshen: The Mennonite Historical Society, 1949.

Fuchs, Emil. Leonhard Ragaz Prophet Unser Zeit. Oberursel/Ts: Kompass-Verlag, n. d.

Foster, Frank Hugh. History of New England Theology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1907.

Gabriel, Ralph Henry. The Course of American Democratic Thought. New York: Ronald Press, 1940.

Gangulee, N. Giuseppe Mazzini, Selected Writings. London: Lindsay Drummond, Ltd., 1944.

Geiger, George R. The Philosophy of Henry George. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.

George, Henry. Progress and Poverty. New York: Random House, n. d.

Gottschalk, Louis. Understanding History, a Primer on Historical Method. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1950.

Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma, I. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1905.

_______. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. New York: Putnam and Co., 1908.

_______. What is Christianity? London: Williams and Norgate, 1901.

Hart, Paul K. and Goode, William J. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952.

Heath, Richard. Anabaptism from the Rise at Zwickau to its Fall at Munster, 1521-1536. London: Alexander and Shepheard, 1895.

_______. The Captive City of God. London: Headley Bros., 1905.

Hege, Christian and Neff, Christian (eds.). Mennonitisches Lexikon. Frankfort am Main under Weierhof: Pfalz. III, 1913.

Hopkins, Charles Howard. The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Horton, Walter Marshall. Realistic Theology. New York: Harper and Bros., 1943.

Hudson, Winthrop S. The Great Tradition in the American Churches. New York: Harper and Brothers., 1953.

Hutchison, John A. (ed.). Christian Faith and Social Action. New York: Charles Scribners, 1953.

Kant, Immanuel. Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone. Translated and introduction by Theodore M. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1934.

Kingsley, Charles. Sermons for the Times. London: Macmillan Co., 1884.

Kutter, Herman. Social Democracy: Does It Mean Darkness or Light? Letchworth: Garden City Press, Ltd., 1910.

________. They Must: Or God and the Social Democracy. Chicago: Cooperative Printing Co., 1908.

Laidler, Harry W. (ed.). Social-Economic Movements. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1948.

Littell, Franklin H. The Anabaptist View of the Church. Philadelphia: The American Society of Church History, 1952.

Mackinnon, James. The Origins of the Reformation. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939.

Mackintosh, H. R. Types of Modern Theology. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1937.

Mathews, Shailer. New Faith for the Old, An Autobiography. New York: Macmillan Co., 1936.

________. The Social Teachings of Jesus. New York: Macmillan Co., 1897.

May, Henry F. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949.

Mays, Benjamin (ed.). A Gospel for the Social Awakening. New York: Association Press, 1950.

Mead, Sidney. What is the Place of Church History in the Curriculum? Chicago: Meadville Theological School, 1956.

Morgan, Arthur. Edward Bellamy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.

________. The Philosophy of Edward Bellamy. New York: King's Crown Press, 1944.

Morris, William Dale. The Christian Origins of Social Revolt. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1949.

Nevins, Allan. Gateway to History. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1938.

Newman, A. A. A Manual of Church History. Philadelphia: American Baptists Publication Society, 1908.

Nichols, James Hastings. Democracy and the Churches. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.

_______. History of Christianity 1650-1950. New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. Christ and Culture. New York: Harper and Bros., 1951.

_______. The Kingdom of God in America. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1937.

_______ and Beach, Waldo (eds.). Christian Ethics, Sources of the Living Tradition. New York: Ronald Press, 1955.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. An Interpretation of Christian Ethics. New York: Harper and Bros., 1935.

Ragaz, Leonhard. Der Kamp um das Reich Gottes in Blumhardt Vater und Sohn--und Weiter! Erlenbach-Zurich: Rotapfel Verlag, 1922.

_______. Israel, Judaism and Christianity. London: Victor Gallanncz, Ltd., 1947.

_______. Le Message revolutionnaire. Zurich: Neuchatel, 1941.

Rauschenbusch, Walter and Sankey, Ira. Evangeliums-Lieder 1 und 2. New York: Biglow and Main Co., 1893.

_______. Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch. Kassel: J. G. Oncken, 1901.

_______. Christianity and the Social Crisis. New York: Macmillan Co., 1907.

_______. For God and the People: Prayers of the Social Awakening. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1910.

_______. Unto Me. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1912.

_______. Christianizing the Social Order. New York: Macmillan Co., 1912.

_______. Dare We Be Christians? Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1914.

_______. The Social Principles of Jesus. New York: Association Press, 1914.

_______. A Theology for the Social Gospel. New York: Macmillan Co., 1917.

Raven, Charles E. Christian Socialism 1848-1854. London: Macmillan Co., 1920.

Reckitt, Maurice B. Maurice to Temple. London: Faber and Faber, 1950.

Ritschl, Albrecht. Instruction in the Christian Religion. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.

________. The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900.

________. Geschichte des Pietismus im der lutherischen Kirch des 17 and 18 Jahrhunderts. Bonn: A. Marcus, 1880.

Roberts, David E. and Van Dusen, Henry Pitney (eds.). Liberal Theology, An Appraisal. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942.

Royce, Josiah. The Problem of Christianity. I. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913.

Schneider, Carl E. The German Church on the American Frontier. St. Louis: Eden Publishing Co., 1939.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus, a Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimorus to Wrede. Translated by W. Montgomery. New York: Macmillan Co., 1948.

Scott, Robert and Stiles, W. C. (eds.). Modern Sermons by World Scholars, Vol. VIII. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909.

Sharpe, Dores Robinson. Walter Rauschenbusch. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942.

Shinn, Roger Lincoln. Christianity and the Problem of History. New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1953.

Silone, Ignazio. The Living Thoughts of Mazzini. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939.

Smith, Walter A. "The Religion of Edward Bellamy." Unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1937.

Sweet, William Warren. The Story of Religion in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

________. Makers of Christianity. New York: Henry Holt, 1937.

Torbet, Robert. A History of the Baptists. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1950.

Troeltsch, Ernst. Protestantism and Progress. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

________. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, Vols. I and II. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1949.

Vedder, Henry C. Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus. New York: Macmillan Co., 1914.

Visser t' Hooft, W. A. The Background of the Social Gospel in America. Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink and Zoon, 1928.

Ward, Harry. "Walter Rauschenbusch," in Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. XV. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1908.

Weigle, Luther A. American Idealism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928.

Williams, Daniel Day. God's Grace and Man's Hope. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949.

Zucker, A. S. (ed.). The Forty Eighters, Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

Zummach, Charles F. These Glorious Years, The Centenary History of the German Baptists of North America, 1843-1943. Cleveland: Roger Williams Press, 1943.

Articles and Periodicals

Bainton, Roland H. "The Left-Wing of the Reformation," Journal of Religion, XXL (April, 1941), 125-134.

Bender, Harold S. "The Pacifism of the Sixteenth Century Anabaptists," Church History, XXIV (June, 1955), 119-130.

________. "The Anabaptist Vision," Church History, XIII (March, 1944), 3-24.

Bennett, John C. "Enduring Bases for Social Action," Social Action, IX (June, 1943), 18.

Davis, George W. "The Origins and Principles of Evangelical Christianity," The Crozer Quarterly, XXIII (July, 1946), 223-225.

Friedmann, Robert. "Recent Interpretations of Anabaptism," Church History, XXIV (June, 1955), 132-149.

Hudson, Winthrop S. "Baptists are Not Anabaptists," The Chronicle. (Journal of the American Baptist Historical Society), XVI (Oct., 1953), 171-178.

McGiffert, A. C., Jr. "Rauschenbusch After Twenty Years," Christendom, III (Autumn, 1938), 98-109.

McKelvey, Blake. "Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester," Rochester History, XIV (Oct., 1952), 1-16.

Moehlman, Conrad H. "Who is Walter Rauschenbusch?" The Crozer Quarterly, XXIII (Jan., 1946), 34-38.

Ramsey, Paul. "A Theology for Social Action," Social Action, XII (Oct. 15, 1946), 10.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. "The Churches and the Liberal Tradition," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLVI (March, 1948), 162-163.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. "The Zurich Anabaptists and Thomas Munzer," The American Journal of Theology, IX (Jan., 1905).

________. "The Revolutionary Ancestry of the Congregationalists and Baptists," The Springfield Daily Republican, Dec. 1, 1908.

________. "The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology," American Journal of Theology, XI (Jan., 1907).

________. "The Prophetic Character of the Anabaptist Movement," Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Sept., 15, 1903.

________. "The Religion of the Passion Play," Rauschenbusch Scrapbook, III, 1910.

________. "Why I Am a Baptist," Rochester Baptist Monthly, XX (1905-1906), reprinted Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin, Dec., 1938.

________. "Ideals of Social Reformers," American Journal of Sociology, II (Sept., 1896), 202-219.

________. "The New Evangelism," The Independent, LVI (May 12, 1904), 1056-1061.

________. "The Belated Races and the Social Problem," Rauschenbusch Scrapbook, III, n. d.

________. For the Right, (1889-1891). A complete file of this journal in which Walter Rauschenbusch did much of the writing was available in microfilm from Yale University.

Rochester Theological Seminary Bulletin, "Rauschenbusch Number," LXIX (Nov., 1918).

Schneider, Carl E. "The Americanization of Walter Rauschenbusch," Church History, XXIV (Sept., 1955), 3-14.

________. "The German Church on the American Frontier," Church History, XXIV (March, 1955), 3-9.

Smucker, Donovan E. "The Anabaptist Historiography in the Scholarship of Today," Mennonite Quarterly Review, XXII (April, 1948).

Reports

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress. "The Pulpit in Relation to Social and Political Reform," X (1891), 127-129; "The Church and Money Power," XI (1892), 10-17; "Relations of Church to State," XVIII (1899), 138-140; "Does the New Testament Provide a Definite and Permanent Church Polity?" XXII (1903), 108-115.

Pamphlets

Rauschenbusch, Walter. The Freedom of Spiritual Religion. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1910.

________. Die Geschichte der Idee des Reiches Gottes. Rochester: Rochester Theological Seminary, 1902.

Unpublished Material

Barnett, Henlee Hulix. "The Ethical Thought of Walter Rauschenbusch." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948.

Burckhardt, Abel E. "Walter Rauschenbusch as a Representative of American Humanism." Unpublished Th. M. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary (New York), 1925.

Gelzer, David. "Mission to America, Being a History of the Work of the Basel Foreign Missions Society in America." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1952.

Mead, Sidney Earl and Nichols, James Hastings. "The History of Christianity Since 1650." Lecture Notes. University of Chicago, n. d. (Mimeographed.)

Rauschenbusch, Walter. "Henry George." From the D. R. Sharpe Collection, 1887.

________. "The New Apostolate." From the D. R. Sharpe Collection, 1893.

Weatherly, Owen. "A Comparative Study of the Social Ethics of Walter Rauschenbusch and Reinhold Niebuhr." Unpublished M. A. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.

Williams, Daniel Day. "Constructive Theology." Lecture notes. University of Chicago, 1950. (Mimeographed.)

Wray, Frank J. "History in the Eyes of the Sixteenth Century Anabaptists." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1953.

Other Sources

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. The library of Colgate-Rochester contains three Rauschenbusch scrapbooks. These scrapbooks include numerous primary and secondary sources for the study of Walter Rauschenbusch.

Eden Theological Seminary. Archives of this Seminary contain an extensive collection of letters written by August Rauschenbusch to individuals in Germany and America. The archives were developed by Professor Carl E. Schneider.

Goshen College. Personal interview with Dean H. S. Bender, July 7, 1954.

Elmhurst College. Rudolph Schaade of the Elmhurst faculty was the former pastor of the Second German Baptist church in New York where Rauschenbusch served for ten years. He has materials from this church which are valuable.

Moehlman, C. W. The former church history professor at Colgate-Rochester edited an anthology of Walter Rauschenbusch's essays in 1953 entitled, "A Rauschenbusch Sourcebook with Commentary." Only two copies were made available one of which is owned by the present writer.

North American Baptist Headquarters. The former German Baptist denomination to which August and Walter Rauschenbusch belonged has an extensive file of materials under the direction of M. L. Leuschner, editor of the major publications of this group.

Sharpe, D. R. The former secretary to Walter Rauschenbusch has a large collection of materials concerning Walter Rauschenbusch which were made available for this dissertation.

University of Chicago. Personal interview with Professor Louis Gottschalk, Dec. 7, 1956.

Yale University. Personal interview with Professor Roland H. Bainton, Nov. 28, 1956.